arXiv:1412.6949v4 [physics.flu-dyn] 3 Oct 2016

A critical examination of the statistical symmetries admitted by the Lundgren-Monin-Novikov hierarchy of unconfined turbulence

M. Frewer [1*], G. Khujadze [2] & H. Foysi [2]

[1] Trübnerstr. 42, 69121 Heidelberg, Germany
[2] Chair of Fluid Mechanics, Universität Siegen, 57068 Siegen, Germany

October 4, 2016

Abstract

We present a critical examination of the recent article by Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) which proposes two new statistical symmetries in the classical theory for turbulent hydrodynamic flows. We first show that both symmetries are unphysical in that they induce inconsistencies due to violating the principle of causality. In addition, they must get broken in order to be consistent with all physical constraints naturally arising in the statistical Lundgren-Monin-Novikov (LMN) description of turbulence. As a result, we state that besides the well-known classical symmetries of the LMN equations no new statistical symmetries exist. Yet, aside from this particular issue, the article by Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) is flawed in more than one respect, ranging from an incomplete proof, to a self-contradicting statement up to an incorrect claim. All these aspects will be listed, discussed and corrected, thus obtaining a completely opposite conclusion in our study than the article by Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) is proposing.

Keywords: *Turbulence, Lie Groups, Symmetries, Probability Density Functions, Principle of Causality, Closure Problem, Scaling Laws, Random Galilean Invariance, Intermittency*;
PACS: 47.10.-g, 47.27.-i, 05.20.-y, 02.20.Qs, 02.50.Cw

1. Introduction

In order to examine the article by Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) as clearly as possible, we will analyze it step by step and list all our objections according to their relevance in how they contribute to the articles' two main conclusions, in that: (i) a new turbulent scaling law is proposed which has been derived as an invariant solution from two new statistical symmetries, and (ii) one of which, namely the new statistical *scaling* symmetry, has been identified as a measure for the intermittent flow behavior of the velocity signal. Unfortunately, however, both these conclusions cannot be confirmed when considering the following facts we present in this study. But before we begin our critical examination, a brief summary of Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) will be helpful: Based on the instantaneous multi-point velocity correlation moments of order $n+1$

$$H_{i_{\{n+1\}}} = H_{i_{(1)}i_{(2)}\ldots i_{(n+1)}} = \langle U_{i_{(1)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(1)},t)\cdots U_{i_{(n+1)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(n+1)},t)\rangle, \quad n\geq 0, \tag{1.1}$$

which evolve according to the Friedmann-Keller multi-point correlation (MPC) equations

$$\frac{\partial H_{i_{\{n+1\}}}}{\partial t} + \sum_{l=1}^{n+1}\left[\frac{\partial H_{i_{\{n+2\}}[i_{(n+2)}\mapsto k_{(l)}]}[\mathbf{x}_{(n+2)}\mapsto \mathbf{x}_{(l)}]}{\partial x_{k_{(l)}}} + \frac{\partial I_{i_{\{n\}}[l]}}{\partial x_{i_{(l)}}} - \nu\frac{\partial H_{i_{\{n+1\}}}}{\partial x_{k_{(l)}}\partial x_{k_{(l)}}}\right] = 0, \tag{1.2}$$

*Email address for correspondence: frewer.science@gmail.com

along with the continuity constraints for the velocity moments

$$\frac{\partial H_{i_{\{n+1\}}[i_{(l)}\mapsto k_{(l)}]}}{\partial x_{k_{(l)}}} = 0, \quad \text{for } l = 1, \ldots, n+1, \tag{1.3}$$

and for the velocity-pressure moments

$$\frac{\partial I_{i_{\{n\}}[k][i_{(l)}\mapsto m_{(l)}]}}{\partial x_{m_{(l)}}} = 0, \quad \text{for } k, l = 1, \ldots, n+1, \text{ and } k \neq l, \tag{1.4}$$

where the latter moments are defined as

$$I_{i_{\{n\}}[l]} = \langle U_{i_{(1)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(1)}, t) \cdots U_{i_{(l-1)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(l-1)}, t) \cdot P(\mathbf{x}_{(l)}, t) \cdot U_{i_{(l+1)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(l+1)}, t) \cdots U_{i_{(n+1)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(n+1)}, t) \rangle, \tag{1.5}$$

it is argued in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) that next to the classical statistical symmetries

$$\bar{T}_1: \quad t^* = t + a_1, \quad \mathbf{x}^*_{(l)} = \mathbf{x}_{(l)}, \quad \mathbf{H}^*_{\{n\}} = \mathbf{H}_{\{n\}}, \quad \mathbf{I}^*_{\{n\}} = \mathbf{I}_{\{n\}}, \tag{1.6}$$

$$\bar{T}_2: \quad t^* = t, \quad \mathbf{x}^*_{(l)} = e^{a_2}\mathbf{x}_{(l)}, \quad \mathbf{H}^*_{\{n\}} = e^{n\cdot a_2}\mathbf{H}_{\{n\}}, \quad \mathbf{I}^*_{\{n\}} = e^{(n+2)a_2}\mathbf{I}_{\{n\}}, \tag{1.7}$$

$$\bar{T}_3: \quad t^* = e^{a_3}t, \quad \mathbf{x}^*_{(l)} = \mathbf{x}_{(l)}, \quad \mathbf{H}^*_{\{n\}} = e^{-n\cdot a_3}\mathbf{H}_{\{n\}}, \quad \mathbf{I}^*_{\{n\}} = e^{-(n+2)a_3}\mathbf{I}_{\{n\}}, \tag{1.8}$$

$$\bar{T}_4 - \bar{T}_6: \quad t^* = t, \quad \mathbf{x}^*_{(l)} = \mathbf{a}\cdot\mathbf{x}_{(l)}, \quad \mathbf{H}^*_{\{n\}} = \mathbf{A}_{\{n\}} \otimes \mathbf{H}_{\{n\}}, \quad \mathbf{I}^*_{\{n\}} = \mathbf{A}_{\{n\}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{\{n\}}, \tag{1.9}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{T}_7 - \bar{T}_9: \quad & t^* = t, \quad \mathbf{x}^*_{(l)} = \mathbf{x}_{(l)} + \mathbf{f}(t), \quad \mathbf{H}^*_{\{n\}} = \mathbf{H}_{\{n\}} + \sum_{b=1}^{n} f'_{i_{(b)}}(t)\mathbf{H}_{\{n-1\}[i_{(b)}\mapsto\emptyset]}, \\ & \mathbf{I}^*_{\{n\}[l]} = \mathbf{I}_{\{n\}[l]} - f''_\beta x_{\beta_{(l)}}\mathbf{H}_{\{n-1\}[l\mapsto\emptyset]} + \sum_{c=1, c\neq l}^{n+1} f'_{i_{(b)}}\mathbf{I}_{\{n-1\}[l][c\mapsto\emptyset]}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.10}$$

$$\bar{T}_{10}: \quad t^* = t, \quad \mathbf{x}^*_{(l)} = \mathbf{x}_{(l)}, \quad \mathbf{H}^*_{\{n\}} = \mathbf{H}_{\{n\}}, \quad \mathbf{I}^*_{\{n\}[l]} = \mathbf{I}_{\{n\}[l]} + f_4(t)\mathbf{H}_{\{n\}[i_{(l)}\mapsto\emptyset]}, \tag{1.11}$$

where f's are free functions and $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{a}_{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{a}_{(n)}$ is a n-point concatenation of a rotation matrix $\mathbf{a} \in \mathrm{O}(3)$, the MPC equations (1.2) admit two more statistical symmetries

$$\bar{T}'_{2_{\{n\}}}: \quad t^* = t, \quad \mathbf{x}^*_{(l)} = \mathbf{x}_{(l)}, \quad \mathbf{H}^*_{\{n\}} = \mathbf{H}_{\{n\}} + \mathbf{C}_{\{n\}}, \quad \mathbf{I}^*_{\{n\}} = \mathbf{I}_{\{n\}} + \mathbf{D}_{\{n\}}, \tag{1.12}$$

$$\bar{T}'_s: \quad t^* = t, \quad \mathbf{x}^*_{(l)} = \mathbf{x}_{(l)}, \quad \mathbf{H}^*_{\{n\}} = e^{a_s}\mathbf{H}_{\{n\}}, \quad \mathbf{I}^*_{\{n\}} = e^{a_s}\mathbf{I}_{\{n\}}, \tag{1.13}$$

which, in contrast to the above classical symmetries (1.6)-(1.11), are *not* reflected by the underlying deterministic Euler and Navier-Stokes equations. For $n = 1$ in the velocity moments $\mathbf{H}_{\{n\}}$, the translation symmetry (1.12)

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{T}'_{2_{\{l\}}}: \quad & t^* = t, \quad \mathbf{x}^*_{(l)} = \mathbf{x}_{(l)}, \quad \mathbf{H}^*_{\{1\}} = \mathbf{H}_{\{1\}} + \mathbf{C}_{\{1\}}, \\ & \mathbf{H}^*_{\{n\}} = \mathbf{H}_{\{n\}}, \quad \mathbf{I}^*_{\{m\}} = \mathbf{I}_{\{m\}} + \mathbf{D}_{\{m\}}, \quad \text{for } n \geq 2,\ m \geq 1, \end{aligned} \tag{1.14}$$

is furthermore identified in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) as the random Galilean group or random Galilean invariance as was first introduced by Kraichnan (1964, 1965, 1968).

It is then shown that all symmetries for the moments (1.6)-(1.13)[†] transcribe to symmetries for the probability density functions (PDFs)

$$f_n = f_n(1, \ldots, n) = f_n(\mathbf{v}_{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_{(n)}; \mathbf{x}_{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{(n)}, t), \tag{1.15}$$

[†]Except for the extended Galilean invariance (1.10) which has to be restricted to $\mathbf{f}''(t) = 0$ in order to be consistent with a necessary solution manifold of bounded functions.

which themselves evolve according the Lundgren-Monin-Novikov (LMN) equations

$$\left[\partial_t + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{v}_{(i)} \cdot \nabla_{(i)}\right] f_n = -\sum_{j=1}^{n} \nabla_{\mathbf{v}_{(j)}} \cdot \left[\lim_{\mathbf{x}_{(n+1)} \to \mathbf{x}_{(j)}} \nu \Delta_{(n+1)} \int d\mathbf{v}_{(n+1)} \mathbf{v}_{(n+1)} f_{n+1} \right.$$
$$\left. - \int d\mathbf{x}_{(n+1)} d\mathbf{v}_{(n+1)} \left(\nabla_{(j)} \frac{1}{4\pi |\mathbf{x}_{(j)} - \mathbf{x}_{(n+1)}|}\right) (\mathbf{v}_{(n+1)} \cdot \nabla_{(n+1)})^2 f_{n+1}\right], \quad (1.16)$$

which, next to the continuity conditions, go along with several natural constraints in order to guarantee a physical solution for the PDFs f_n. Considered are the *normalization constraint*

$$\int d\mathbf{v}_{(1)} f_1(\mathbf{v}_{(1)}; \mathbf{x}_{(1)}, t) = 1,$$
$$\int d\mathbf{v}_{(2)} f_2(\mathbf{v}_{(1)}, \mathbf{v}_{(2)}; \mathbf{x}_{(1)}, \mathbf{x}_{(2)}, t) = f_1(\mathbf{v}_{(1)}; \mathbf{x}_{(1)}, t), \quad (1.17)$$
$$\vdots$$

the *coincidence constraint*

$$\lim_{\mathbf{x}_{(2)} \to \mathbf{x}_{(1)}} f_2(1,2) = f_1(1) \delta(\mathbf{v}_{(2)} - \mathbf{v}_{(1)}),$$
$$\lim_{\mathbf{x}_{(3)} \to \mathbf{x}_{(1)}} f_3(1,2,3) = f_2(1,2) \delta(\mathbf{v}_{(3)} - \mathbf{v}_{(1)}), \quad (1.18)$$
$$\vdots$$

and the *separation constraint* (here shown only for the two-point PDF)

$$\lim_{|\mathbf{x}_{(2)} - \mathbf{x}_{(1)}| \to \infty} f_2(1,2) = f_1(1) f_1(2). \quad (1.19)$$

According to Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) the corresponding transcribed symmetries to (1.12) and (1.13) admitted by the LMN equations (1.16) are, respectively,[†]

$$\bar{T}'_{2_{\{n\}}}: \quad t^* = t, \quad \mathbf{x}^*_{(n)} = \mathbf{x}_{(n)}, \quad \mathbf{v}^*_{(n)} = \mathbf{v}_{(n)},$$
$$f^*_n = f_n + \psi(\mathbf{v}_{(1)}) \delta(\mathbf{v}_{(1)} - \mathbf{v}_{(2)}) \cdots \delta(\mathbf{v}_{(1)} - \mathbf{v}_{(n)}), \quad (1.20)$$

and

$$\bar{T}'_s: \quad t^* = t, \quad \mathbf{x}^*_{(n)} = \mathbf{x}_{(n)}, \quad \mathbf{v}^*_{(n)} = \mathbf{v}_{(n)},$$
$$f^*_n = e^{a_s} f_n + (1 - e^{a_s}) \cdot \delta(\mathbf{v}_{(1)}) \cdots \delta(\mathbf{v}_{(n)}). \quad (1.21)$$

The invariance (1.20) is called "shape symmetry" as it according to Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) only changes the shape of the PDF, while (1.21) is called "intermittency symmetry" since all transformed PDFs f^*_n, when globally scaled by a same constant factor as in (1.21), are "functions describing intermittent flows" (Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014), p. 2).

Furthermore it is recognized that if the Lie-group structure of both transformations (1.20) and (1.21) is reduced to the structure of a semi-group, then compatibility with the axiomatic constraint $f_n \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow f^*_n \geq 0$ is achieved. It is asserted that although this probabilistic interpretation of the PDFs breaks the Lie-group structure of the transformations (1.20) and (1.21) down to a semi-group, they nevertheless still constitute symmetries of the LMN equations (1.16).

Regarding the compatibility with the other three constraints (1.17)-(1.19), it is claimed that for the translation symmetry (1.20) the separation constraint (1.19) has no influence and thus can be safely ignored for all their purposes considered in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014).

[†]In Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) (1.20) is derived as the result "(42)", and (1.21) as "(63)".

For the scaling symmetry (1.21), however, the separation constraint (1.19) is only compatible if the untransformed PDF "is itself a δ function", because then, according to (1.21), one obtains "$f_n^*(1,\dots,n) = f_n(1,\dots,n) = \delta(\mathbf{v}_{(1)})\cdots\delta(\mathbf{v}_{(n)})$", and "hence, if in the far field $|\mathbf{x}_{(1)} - \mathbf{x}_{(2)}| \to \infty$ the one-point PDF is a δ function $f_1(2) = f_1^*(2) = \delta(\mathbf{v}_{(2)})$, then the separation property is satisfied for the scaling invariance" (Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014), p. 8):

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{|\mathbf{x}_{(1)}-\mathbf{x}_{(2)}|\to\infty} f_2^*(1,2) &= e^{a_s} f_1(1)\delta(\mathbf{v}_{(2)}) + (1-e^{a_s})\delta(\mathbf{v}_{(1)})\delta(\mathbf{v}_{(2)}) \\ &= f_1^*(1)\delta(\mathbf{v}_{(2)}) = f_1^*(1)f_1^*(2). \end{aligned} \tag{1.22}$$

Regarding the coincidence constraint (1.18), both transformations (1.20) and (1.21) are compatible, while for the translation symmetry (1.20) the normalization constraint (1.17) in connection with the axiomatic constraint $f_n \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow f_n^* \geq 0$ imposes restrictions on the scalar function $\psi = \psi(\mathbf{v})$. These restrictions are then derived by attempting "to find a physical interpretation of the shape symmetry". According to Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) this is achieved by constructing a PDF which can be written as a sum of a turbulent and laminar part $f = f_T + f_L$, for which then, when addressing the particular case of fully developed plane Poiseuille channel flow, the laminar part (due to the explicit presence of the non-moving boundaries at $y_{(k)} = \pm H$) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} f_L(\mathbf{v}_{(1)},\dots,\mathbf{v}_{(n)};\mathbf{x}_{(1)},\dots,\mathbf{x}_{(n)},t) = \Bigg\langle \delta\left[\mathbf{v}_{(1)} - \mathbf{U}_0^{\{\omega\}}\left(1-\frac{y_{(1)}^2}{H^2}\right)\right] \\ \cdots \delta\left[\mathbf{v}_{(n)} - \mathbf{U}_0^{\{\omega\}}\left(1-\frac{y_{(n)}^2}{H^2}\right)\right]\Bigg\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{1.23}$$

where the constant field $\mathbf{U}_0^{\{\omega\}} = (U_0^{\{\omega\}}, 0, 0)$ is the streamwise velocity in the centerline and $y_{(k)} = x_{(k)2}$ is the wall-normal coordinate.

It is then argued that the "shape symmetry" (1.20) in channel flow takes the following form

$$f_n^* = f_n + F(y_{(1)},\dots,y_{(n)})\psi(\mathbf{v}'_{(1)})\delta(\mathbf{v}'_{(1)} - \mathbf{v}'_{(2)})\cdots\delta(\mathbf{v}'_{(1)} - \mathbf{v}'_{(n)}), \tag{1.24}$$

where

$$F(y_{(1)},\dots,y_{(n)}) = \left(1-\frac{y_{(1)}^2}{H^2}\right)^{-1}\cdots\left(1-\frac{y_{(n)}^2}{H^2}\right)^{-1}, \tag{1.25}$$

and for each k

$$v'_{(k)1} = v_{(k)1}\left(1-\frac{y_{(k)}^2}{H^2}\right)^{-1}, \quad v'_{(k)2} = v_{(k)2}, \quad v'_{(k)3} = v_{(k)3}. \tag{1.26}$$

This symmetry (1.24) then gives rise to the following invariant translation for the moments

$$\begin{aligned}\langle U_1(\mathbf{x}_{(1)},t)\cdots U_1(\mathbf{x}_{(n)},t)\rangle^* = \langle U_1(\mathbf{x}_{(1)},t)\cdots U_1(\mathbf{x}_{(n)},t)\rangle \\ + C_{1\dots1}\left(1-\frac{y_{(1)}^2}{H^2}\right)\cdots\left(1-\frac{y_{(n)}^2}{H^2}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{1.27}$$

where, according to Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014), the coefficients $C_{1\dots1}$ are restricted within the following ranges:

$$-2U_{0\mathrm{cr}} \leq C_1 \leq 2U_{0\mathrm{cr}}, \quad -U_{0\mathrm{cr}}^2 \leq C_{11} \leq U_{0\mathrm{cr}}^2, \quad -2U_{0\mathrm{cr}}^3 \leq C_{111} \leq 2U_{0\mathrm{cr}}^3, \quad \cdots \tag{1.28}$$

with $U_{0\mathrm{cr}}$ being the critical value up to which a laminar channel flow can be realized.

As a final result in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014), the invariant solution for the mean velocity in the *intermittent* flow regime of a plane channel flow is derived. By considering i) the classical scaling of the Navier-Stokes equations $y^* = e^{k_2}y$ and $\langle U\rangle^* = e^{-k_2}\langle U\rangle$, where k_2 is

an arbitrary constant, ii) the new scaling symmetry $\langle U\rangle^* = e^{a_s}\langle U\rangle$ (1.13), and iii) the new translation symmetry of the mean velocity $\langle U\rangle^* = \langle U\rangle + C_1(1-y^2/H^2)$ (1.27), where C_1 is restricted by (1.28), the requested invariant solution gets determined from the characteristic equation

$$\frac{d\langle U\rangle}{(a_s-k_2)\langle U\rangle + C_1(1-y^2/H^2)} = \frac{dy}{k_2 y}, \tag{1.29}$$

in the specification $a_s = k_2$ as

$$\langle U\rangle = \frac{C_1}{k_2}\ln(y) + \frac{C_1}{2k_2}\left(1-\frac{y^2}{H^2}\right) + \mathcal{C}, \tag{1.30}$$

where $\mathcal{C}$ is an arbitrary integration constant. This final result (1.30) completes the summary of Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014).

Our critical examination of Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) unfolds as follows: In Section 2 the violation of the classical causality principle by the newly proposed LMN symmetries (1.20)-(1.21) as well as by the correspondingly induced MPC invariances (1.12)-(1.13) is discussed. The shortcomings of the unclosed hierarchy of the MPC equations (1.2) are presented in Section 3. As a consequence, the MPC invariances (1.12)-(1.13) are to be identified only as equivalence transformations, and not as symmetry transformations. The conceptual difference between these two kinds of invariant transformations as well as its implications for constructing invariant solutions is presented in Section 4 and 5, respectively. The non-compatibility of the new LMN symmetries (1.20)-(1.21) with the underlying physical constraints (1.17)-(1.19) is discussed in detail in Section 6. Then, the failure of the "shape symmetry" (1.20) for channel flow is explained in Section 7. As an aside, the non-connectedness of the new MPC translation invariance (1.14) to random Galilean invariance (Kraichnan, 1965), as contrarily claimed in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014), is shown in Section 8. Finally, a general discussion about the illusory relation between intermittency and global symmetries is given in Section 9. In Appendices A and B, the detailed proofs of our statements and objections are presented.

2. Violation of the causality principle

At first it should be noticed that the two new multi-point correlation (MPC) invariances (1.12) and (1.13), which, respectively, are induced by the Lundgren-Monin-Novikov (LMN) symmetries (1.20) and (1.21)[†], only act in a purely statistical manner without having a transformational origin of *any* kind in the underlying deterministic set of equations, i.e. without having a cause in the Navier-Stokes equations themselves; neither as a distinctive symmetry, nor as any ordinary variable transformation. As we will show later in detail, such a property inevitably leads to an unphysical behavior, because it are only the *deterministic* equations which due to their spatially nonlocal and temporally chaotic behavior induce the *statistical* equations, and not vice versa. In other words, any variable transformation, i.e. irrespective of whether it represents a symmetry or not, which only acts on a purely statistical (averaged) level without having a deterministic (fluctuating) origin violates the classical principle of cause and effect, since the system would experience an effect (change in averaged dynamics) without a corresponding cause (change in fluctuating dynamics). Careful, we do *not* claim here that the new statistical symmetries (1.12) and (1.13), which are induced by (1.20) and (1.21) respectively, are unphysical just because they are not reflected again as *symmetries* in the original deterministic (instantaneous) Navier-Stokes equations. Such a claim would obviously be even incorrect, because a mean field equation can have a symmetric structure which must not exist in its underlying fluctuating equation. Instead, we only simply claim that these new statistical symmetries have no mechanical

[†]Up to the pressure transformations, since in the LMN approach, with its infinite equational hierarchy (1.16), the pressure has been eliminated by the continuity equation, while in the MPC approach, with its infinite equational hierarchy (1.2), the pressure is explicitly included.

cause at all from which they can originate — one even runs into inconsistencies as soon as one tries to establish any such cause, which in detail we will demonstrate in a proof further below. Hence, the classical principle of cause and effect is clearly violated by the new statistical symmetries[†] proposed in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014).

Let us first examine our claim for the case of the two LMN symmetries (1.20) and (1.21). One observes that for both symmetries only the coarse-grained probability density function (PDF) f_n gets transformed, while the sampled values $\mathbf{v}_{(n)}$ for the fine-grained instantaneous (fluctuating) velocity field $\mathbf{U}$ at point $\mathbf{x}_{(n)}$ and time t stay invariant and thus unchanged. That means that since next to the sampled values $\mathbf{v}_{(n)}$ for the fine-grained velocity field $\mathbf{U}$ also, independently, the explicit time t and all spatial measurement points $\mathbf{x}_{(n)}$ are left unchanged, any arbitrary but fixed chosen deterministic system $(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{U})$ will therefore be incapable to evolve (temporally as well as spatially) during the transformation process of (1.20) and (1.21). Only the statistical (coarse-grained) quantities f_n change, but which again, however, uniquely emerge from the deterministic (fine-grained) description of that system. In other words, although the dynamical system $(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{U})$ stays unchanged under both symmetry transformations (1.20) and (1.21) on its fine-grained level, it nevertheless undergoes a *global* change $f_n \to f_n^*$ on its induced coarse-grained level, which is completely unphysical and not realized in nature since it obviously violates the causality principle of classical mechanics. Keep in mind that here the coarse-grained multi-point PDF f_n is defined as an ensemble average over all possible fine-grained realizations of the flow (see e.g. Lundgren (1967); Friedrich *et al.* (2012))

$$f_n(\mathbf{x}_{(1)}, \mathbf{v}_{(1)}; \dots ; \mathbf{x}_{(n)}, \mathbf{v}_{(n)}; t) = \Big\langle \prod_{i=1}^{n} \delta(\mathbf{v}_{(i)} - \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_{(i)}, t)) \Big\rangle, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes the averaging or coarse-graining process, and all $\mathbf{v}_{(i)}$ the sampled values of the fluctuating or fine-grained instantaneous velocity field $\mathbf{U}$ at every point $\mathbf{x}_{(i)}$ and time t. For the first two lowest orders, i.e. $n = 1$ and $n = 2$, the general expression (2.1) reduces in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) to "(17)" and its subsequent expression respectively.

Note that the opposite conclusion is not the rule, i.e. a change on the fluctuating level can occur without inducing an effect on the averaged level. A macroscopic or coarse-grained (averaged) observation might be insensitive to many microscopic or fine-grained (fluctuating) details, a property of nature widely known as universality (see e.g. Marro (2014)). For example, a high-level complex coherent turbulent structure, though a consequence of the low-level fluctuating description, does not depend on all its details on its lowest level. The opposite again, however, is not realized in nature, i.e., stated differently, if the coherent structure experiences a *global* change on the averaged level, e.g. in scale or in a translational shift, it definitely must have a cause and thus must go along with a corresponding change on the lower fluctuating level.

Apart from this unphysical transformation behavior of (1.20) and (1.21) on the coarse-grained level, both symmetries consequently induce inconsistencies also on the fine-grained level which eventually can only be resolved if these two symmetries get broken. Because, although by construction each of these two symmetries leave the coarse-grained LMN equations invariant, they are nevertheless incompatible to the defining relation (2.1), which explicitly defines the transition from the fine-grained level $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_{(n)}, t)$ to the coarse-grained

[†]To note is that we only consider here the admitted symmetries of equations, and not of their solutions. Because, obviously, the induced statistical system can have solutions which are not reflected by the underlying deterministic system, although both systems admit the same equational symmetry. For example in turbulent channel flow, the time-translation symmetry of the Navier-Stokes equations can induce a temporally stationary solution in the statistical system of equations, while in the instantaneous equations not. The classical principle of cause and effect, however, is not violated hereby, because, obviously, the transformation itself, i.e. the time translation itself, is an existing and well-defined equational transformation on both the statistical and its underlying deterministic level, in the way that the statistical time translation symmetry emerges as an effect from the cause of transforming the underlying deterministic field to different times; in clear contrast of course to the new statistical symmetries proposed in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014), which exist without any cause at all. For a further discussion, see also Frewer *et al.* (2016).

level f_n. The deeper reason for this failure in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) is that the defining relation (2.1) itself was not included or incorporated into the construction process for the symmetries (1.20) and (1.21) of the LMN equations.

In order to reveal this breaking of invariance, it is helpful to mentally split relation (2.1) into its left-hand side (LHS) and into its right-hand side (RHS), where the RHS then has to be identified as the realization of the function f_n on the LHS. Now, as both transformations (1.20) and (1.21) induce a *global* change on the LHS, the equality for invariance in (2.1) then demands for a corresponding change also on its RHS. But since the sampled velocities $\mathbf{v}_{(n)}$ in (1.20) as well as (1.21) stay invariant, i.e. unchanged, the fine-grained velocity fields $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_{(n)}, t)$ then have to change in order to compensate for the global change which occurs on the LHS. But this instantly leads to a contradiction, because if the velocity fields $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_{(n)}, t)$ change then also the sampled velocities $\mathbf{v}_{(n)}$ should change respectively, but according to (1.20) and (1.21) all $\mathbf{v}_{(n)}$ may *not* change, ending thus in the proclaimed incompatibility.

Hence, the defining relation (2.1) not only breaks the symmetries (1.20) and (1.21) down to non-symmetry transformations, but ultimately also degrades them down to non-physical transformations due to violating the principle of causality in that an arbitrary but fixed chosen deterministic system would experience a global change on the coarse-grained level without experiencing any change on its fine-grained level; a process which, as already said before, simply is not realized in nature, and thus is completely unphysical.[†]

This physical inconsistency can also be directly observed on the lower statistical level of the MPC invariances (1.12) and (1.13). For brevity we will only consider the scaling invariance (1.13) — for the translation invariance (1.12) the line of argumentation is similar. Now, to expose this inconsistency on the MPC level, we recall that the velocity correlation function $\mathbf{H}_{\{n\}}$ in (1.13) is nonlinearly built up by n multiplicative evaluations of the single instantaneous (fluctuating) velocity field $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ according to (1.1). With this information at hand, the following chain of reasoning instantly emerges: Since for $n = 1$ the averaged function $\mathbf{H}_{\{1\}} = \langle \mathbf{U}_{(1)} \rangle$ scales as e^{a_s} for all points $\mathbf{x}_{(1)} = \mathbf{x}$ in the single physical domain $\mathbf{x}$, the corresponding fluctuating quantity $\mathbf{U}_{(1)}$ has to scale in the same manner, since every averaging operator $\langle , \rangle$ is linearly commuting with any *constant* scale factor. But this implies that any product of n fluctuating fields $\mathbf{U}_{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{U}_{(n)}$ has to scale as $e^{n \cdot a_s}$, which again implies that also the corresponding averaged quantity $\mathbf{H}_{\{n\}} = \langle \mathbf{U}_{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{U}_{(n)} \rangle$ then has to scale as $e^{n \cdot a_s}$. Hence, for *all* points $\mathbf{x}_{(1)} = \mathbf{x}$ and *all* possible configurations of the instantaneous velocity field $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, t)$, this chain of reasoning symbolically reads as (Frewer *et al.*, 2014):

$$
\begin{aligned}
H^*_{i_{\{1\}}} = e^{a_s} H_{i_{\{1\}}} \;&\Rightarrow\; \langle U^*_{i_{(1)}}(\mathbf{x}^*_{(1)}) \rangle = e^{a_s} \langle U_{i_{(1)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(1)}) \rangle, \quad \text{for all points } \mathbf{x}_{(1)} = \mathbf{x} \\
&\Rightarrow\; \langle U^*_{i_{(k)}}(\mathbf{x}^*_{(k)}) \rangle = e^{a_s} \langle U_{i_{(k)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(k)}) \rangle, \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1 \\
&\Rightarrow\; \langle U^*_{i_{(k)}}(\mathbf{x}^*_{(k)}) \rangle = \langle e^{a_s} U_{i_{(k)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(k)}) \rangle, \quad \text{for all possible configurations } \mathbf{U} \\
&\Rightarrow\; U^*_{i_{(k)}}(\mathbf{x}^*_{(k)}) = e^{a_s} U_{i_{(k)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(k)}) \\
&\Rightarrow\; U^*_{i_{(1)}}(\mathbf{x}^*_{(1)}) \cdots U^*_{i_{(n)}}(\mathbf{x}^*_{(n)}) = e^{n \cdot a_s} U_{i_{(1)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(1)}) \cdots U_{i_{(n)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(n)}) \\
&\Rightarrow\; \langle U^*_{i_{(1)}}(\mathbf{x}^*_{(1)}) \cdots U^*_{i_{(n)}}(\mathbf{x}^*_{(n)}) \rangle = \langle e^{n \cdot a_s} U_{i_{(1)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(1)}) \cdots U_{i_{(n)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(n)}) \rangle \\
&\Rightarrow\; \langle U^*_{i_{(1)}}(\mathbf{x}^*_{(1)}) \cdots U^*_{i_{(n)}}(\mathbf{x}^*_{(n)}) \rangle = e^{n \cdot a_s} \langle U_{i_{(1)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(1)}) \cdots U_{i_{(n)}}(\mathbf{x}_{(n)}) \rangle \\
&\Rightarrow\; H^*_{i_{\{n\}}} = e^{n \cdot a_s} H_{i_{\{n\}}}. \qquad (2.2)
\end{aligned}
$$

For a detailed explanation of this proof in all its steps, please refer to Appendix A. Conclusion (2.2) clearly demonstrates that if the 1-point function $\mathbf{H}_{\{1\}}$ globally scales as e^{a_s} then the n-point function $\mathbf{H}_{\{n\}}$ has to scale accordingly, namely as $e^{n \cdot a_s}$ and not as e^{a_s} as

[†]Note again that the opposite case, i.e. a change on the fine-grained and *no* change on the coarse-grained level, is a constant physical realization in nature and thus *not* in conflict with the causality principle. Technically this means that the kernel on the right-hand of (2.1) (the fine-grained level) can experience a transformational change which can be averaged out to zero, thus inducing a transformational invariance on the left-hand side of (2.1) (the coarse-grained level) which in the result then stays itself unchanged.

dictated by relation (1.13). Only the former scaling $e^{n\cdot a_s}$ will guarantee for an all-over consistent relation between the fluctuating and averaged dynamical Navier-Stokes system. In other words, if a dynamical system experiences a *global* transformational change on the averaged level then there must exist *at least* one corresponding change on the fluctuating level (Frewer *et al.*, 2016). But exactly this is not the case for (1.13) as both $\mathbf{H}_{\{1\}}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{\{n\}}$ scale therein with the *same* global factor, for which, thus, a corresponding fluctuating scaling cannot be derived or constructed, meaning that the system experiences a *global* change on the averaged level with no corresponding change on the fluctuating level — again the classical violation of cause and effect as was already discussed before. For the remaining velocity-pressure correlation functions $\mathbf{I}_{\{n\}}$ in (1.13) the conclusion is accordingly.

To conclude, it should be explicitly pointed out that the above proof (2.2) clearly shows that transformation (1.13) itself, i.e. detached from any transport equations, leads to contradictions as soon as one considers more than one point ($n \geq 2$). However, for $n = 1$, i.e. for the mean velocity $\mathbf{H}_{\{1\}} = \langle \mathbf{U}_{(1)} \rangle$ itself, no contradiction exits. Only as from $n \geq 2$ onwards, the contradiction starts, which can be also clearly observed when comparing to DNS data, as was done e.g. in Frewer *et al.* (2014) and Khujadze & Frewer (2016): The mismatch of the corresponding scaling laws which involve this contradictive scaling group (1.13) gets more strong as the order of the moments n increases. Also note again that in order to perform proof (2.2) we basically used the consistency of $n = 1$ (the first four conclusions of (2.2)) to show the inconsistency for all $n \geq 2$ (the remaining conclusions of (2.2)). Thus, irrelevant of whether (1.13) represents an invariance or not, the transformation itself leads for $n \geq 2$ to contradictions.

Hence, the new MPC invariance (1.13), and with similar argument also (1.12), are both unphysical invariances as the classical principle of causality is violated in every respect. The physical consistency can only be restored if $\mathbf{C}_{\{n\}} = \mathbf{D}_{\{n\}} = \mathbf{0}$ and $a_s = 0$, i.e. if the invariant transformations (1.12) and (1.13) get broken. In contrast, of course, to the classical MPC symmetries $\bar{T}_1$-$\bar{T}_{10}$ (1.6)-(1.11), which, by construction, do not violate causality and thus constitute physical symmetries since they all have their origin in the underlying deterministic Euler or Navier-Stokes equations.

3. Unclosed hierarchy of MPC equations

Although infinite in dimension, the MPC system of equations (1.2) is not closed, not even in a formal sense. The reason is that (1.2) always involves more unknown functions than determining equations, as can be easily confirmed by just explicitly counting the number of equations versus the number of functions to be determined.[†] For each order n in the hierarchy the total number of dynamical equations (1.2), along with the continuity constraint equations (1.3) and (1.4), is always less than the total number of unknown functions. Hereby it should be noted that by construction

$$\begin{aligned} G_{i_{\{n+2\}}[l]} &:= H_{i_{\{n+2\}}[i_{(n+2)}\mapsto k_{(l)}]}[\mathbf{x}_{(n+2)} \mapsto \mathbf{x}_{(l)}] \\ &\neq H_{i_{\{n+2\}}}, \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

i.e., that this defined term $\mathbf{G}_{\{n+2\}[l]}$ appearing in (1.2) is not a $(n+2)$-point function but only a lower dimensional $(n+1)$-point function of $(n+2)$-th moment. Although all components of $\mathbf{G}_{\{n+2\}[l]}$ (3.1) can be uniquely constructed from the higher dimensional moments $\mathbf{H}_{\{n+2\}}$ once they are known, which also can be formally written as

$$\mathbf{G}_{\{n+2\}[l]} = \lim_{\mathbf{x}_{(n+2)}\to\mathbf{x}_{(l)}} \mathbf{H}_{\{n+2\}}, \tag{3.2}$$

the necessary inverse construction, however, fails. Hence, since (3.2) is a non-invertible construction, i.e. since $\mathbf{H}_{\{n+2\}}$ *cannot* be uniquely constructed from $\mathbf{G}_{\{n+2\}[l]}$, these latter

[†] A set of equations is defined as *closed* if the number of equations involved is either equal to or more than the number of dependent variables to be solved for. In contrast, a set of equations is defined as *unclosed* if the number of equations involved is less than the number of unknown dependent variables.

moments are to be identified as unclosed functions in system (1.2) as they do not *directly* enter the next higher order correlation equation. In total this just reflects the classical closure problem of turbulence which cannot be bypassed by simply establishing the formal connection (3.2) — for more details we refer to Frewer *et al.* (2014).

In order to *formally* close this hierarchy (1.2) one has to extend the MPC equations at each order with the lower order moment equations for the corresponding unclosed terms $\mathbf{G}_{\{n+2\}[l]}$ (see e.g. Pope (2000); Davidson (2004)). But this is a formidable task, as these lower-order moment equations cannot be organized or condensed into a single hierarchy anymore as it can be done for the MPC equations given by (1.2). The reason for this jump in complexity is that the above limit (3.2) is not commuting with any spatial linear (differential or integral) operator $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{x}_{(j)}}$, i.e. since for $j \neq i$ we have

$$\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{x}_{(j)}} \cdot \Big(\lim_{\mathbf{x}_{(i)} \to \mathbf{x}_{(j)}} \mathbf{H}_{\{n+2\}} \Big) \neq \lim_{\mathbf{x}_{(i)} \to \mathbf{x}_{(j)}} \Big(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{x}_{(j)}} \cdot \mathbf{H}_{\{n+2\}} \Big), \tag{3.3}$$

each $(n+2)$-point equation will then consequently turn into a lower level $(n+2)$-moment equation with new unclosed terms and with a different formal structure than given in (1.2). It is due to this non-commuting property (3.3) that the number of unclosed terms increases, while at the same time the number constraints decreases (Frewer *et al.*, 2014). Hence, the overall degree of unterdeterminedness of the MPC equations even increases when trying to formally close them; and exactly in this sense we can say that the MPC equations (1.2)-(1.4) (as standardly used in Oberlack & Rosteck (2010); Rosteck & Oberlack (2011); Oberlack & Zieleniewicz (2013); Avsarkisov *et al.* (2014)) are underdetermined, in that they involve more unknowns than equations.

Important to note in this respect is that the LMN equations (1.16) *also* involve such a one-sided (non-invertible) 'lim'-connection between the lower and higher order functions, but, in contrast to the MPC equations, the LMN equations give something in return in that they come along with additional physical constraints (1.17)-(1.19) in order to constitute themselves as a *formally* closed system. In fact, these additional internal constraints will restrict the infinitely many possible (unphysical) solution manifolds of the LMN evolution equations down to a unique (physical) solution manifold (Frewer *et al.*, 2014). Moreover, the LMN equations are just the discrete version of the functional Hopf equation (Hopf, 1952; McComb, 1990; Shen & Wray, 1991), which formally represents itself as a fully closed equation (Monin, 1967).

In other words, only due to the fact that the LMN equations go along with additional physical constraints, they constitute in contrast to the MPC equations a *formally* closed system, and thus also a more physical system, as it was already recognized by Ievlev (1970): "However, the equations for the probability distributions [the LMN equations] yield a more complete and compact statistical description of turbulence than do the usual moment equations [the MPC or Friedman-Keller equations] and apparently permit an easier formulation of the approximate conditions closing the equations."

Finally note that while the transport equations for the moments (MPC) can be uniquely determined from the evolution equations of the PDFs (LMN) (see e.g. Monin (1967)), the reverse cannot be established. In other words, the LMN equations cannot be *uniquely* determined from the MPC equations, which was shown in Ievlev (1970) (see also Monin & Yaglom (1975); Frewer *et al.* (2014)). Hence, the MPC equations are *not* equivalent to the LMN equations.

4. Equivalence versus symmetry transformations

Considering the previous fact that the MPC hierarchy (1.2) is unclosed, it now has consequences when performing an invariance analysis upon it. Instead of generating symmetry transformations, only a weaker class of equivalence transformations can be generated (see e.g. Ovsiannikov (1982); Ibragimov (1994); Meleshko (1996); Ibragimov (2004); Bila (2011)). The reason is that the MPC system of equations, although infinite in dimension,

is underdetermined in that it not only involves the unknown and thus arbitrary functions $\mathbf{G}_{\{n+2\}[l]}$ (3.1), but also in that it's defined forward recursively (Frewer, 2015*a*). Hence, the invariant MPC transformations (1.12) and (1.13) are not to be interpreted as symmetry transformations as misleadingly in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014), but only as equivalence transformations. The consequences for this insight will be discussed in the next section.

The problem is that the quest for finding *symmetry* transformations for a given set of differential equations is fundamentally different to that for finding *equivalence* transformations. The knowledge of symmetry transformations is mainly used to construct special or general solutions of differential equations, while equivalence transformations are used to solve the equivalence problem for a certain class of differential equations by group theory, that is, to find general criteria whether two or more different differential equations are connected by a change of variables drawn from a transformation group. The difference between these two kinds of invariant transformations is defined as (Frewer *et al.*, 2014):

- A *symmetry* of a differential equation is a transformation which maps every solution of the differential equation to another solution of the *same equation*. As a consequence a symmetry transformation leads to complete form-*indifference* of the equation. It results as an invariant transformation if the considered equation is *closed*.

- An *equivalence transformation* for a differential equation in a given class is a change of variables which only maps the equation to another equation in the same class. As a consequence an equivalence transformation *only* leads to a weaker form-*invariance* of the equation. It results as an invariant transformation either if existing parameters of the considered equation get identified as own independent variables, or if the considered equation itself is *unclosed*.

5. On the concept of an invariant solution in turbulence

In order to understand and recognize the subtle difference between a symmetry and an equivalence transformation in its full spectrum, we will discuss this difference again, however, from a second, different perspective, from the perspective of generating invariant solutions.

First of all, one should recognize that the Lie algorithm to generate invariant transformations for differential equations can be equally applied in the same manner without any restrictions to *under-*, *fully-* as well as *overdetermined* systems of equations (Ovsiannikov, 1982; Stephani, 1989; Olver, 1993; Ibragimov, 1994; Andreev *et al.*, 1998; Bluman & Kumei, 1996; Meleshko, 2005), even if the considered system is infinite dimensional (see e.g. Frewer (2015*a*,*b*)). However, only for *fully* or *overdetermined* systems these invariant Lie transformations are called and have the effect of *symmetry* transformations, while for *underdetermined* systems these invariant Lie transformations are called and have the weaker effect of *equivalence* transformations.

In other words, although both a symmetry as well as an equivalence transformation form a Lie-group which by construction leave the considered equations invariant, the action and the consequence of each transformation is absolutely different. While a *symmetry* transformation always maps a solution to another solution of the *same equation*, an equivalence transformation, in contrast, generally only maps a *possible* solution of one underdetermined equation to a *possible* solution of *another underdetermined equation*, where in the latter case we assume of course that a solution of an underdetermined equation can be somehow constructed or is somehow given beforehand.

Now, it is clear that *if* for an unclosed and thus underdetermined equation, or a set of equations, the unclosed terms are *not* correlated to any existing underlying theory, the construction of an invariant solution will only be a particular and non-privileged solution within an infinite set of other possible and equally privileged solutions. But, on the other hand, if the unclosed terms are in fact correlated to an underlying theory, either in that they underly a specific but yet analytically not accessible process or in that they show

some existing but yet unknown substructure, the construction of an invariant *solution* is misleading, and, if no prior modelling assumptions for the unclosed terms are made, essentially even ill-defined (for more details we refer to Frewer *et al.* (2014)).

The statistical theory of turbulence, however, is exactly such a case in which the corresponding unclosed statistical moment equations are connected and thus correlated to an underlying theory, namely to the deterministic Navier-Stokes theory. That is, the MPC equations given by (1.2) are *not* arbitrarily underdetermined, but underdetermined in the sense that *all* unclosed terms $\mathbf{G}_{\{n+2\}[l]}$ (3.1) can be physically and uniquely determined from the *single* underlying but analytically non-accessible instantaneous (fluctuating) velocity field $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ according to (1.1). Hence, no *real* solutions and thus also no *real* invariant solutions can be determined as long as no prior modelling procedure is invoked to close this system of equations.

If, however, within the theory of turbulence such invariant results are nevertheless generated, they must be carefully interpreted as only being functional relations or functional complexes which stay invariant under the derived equivalence group, and not as being privileged *solutions* of an associated underdetermined system, as was also done e.g. in Oberlack & Günther (2003); Khujadze & Oberlack (2004); Günther & Oberlack (2005); Oberlack *et al.* (2006); Oberlack & Rosteck (2010); She *et al.* (2011); Oberlack & Zieleniewicz (2013); Avsarkisov *et al.* (2014). As a consequence, expression (1.30) cannot be identified as an invariant *solution* to the MPC equations (1.2) as misleadingly done by the authors in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014), but only as an invariant *function*, which, by construction, stays invariant under the considered transformation groups. In this sense function (1.30) only possibly but not necessarily may serve as a useful turbulent scaling law. However, since there can be only *one* physical realization for *all* moments, which all are driven by the same single deterministic velocity field $\mathbf{U}$ according to (1.1), and since the performed statistical invariance analysis in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) did not appropriately involve this underlying deterministic layer of description, the chances are extremely low that exactly this particular invariant function (1.30) should represent the statistically correct and thus for all correlation orders n (within the hierarchy (1.2)) consistent solution to the complex inertial scaling problem of incompressible wall-bounded turbulence. Aside from the fact that (1.30) is based on unphysical reasoning, the deeper reason for this negative result, in being unable to obtain a first-principle wall-bounded turbulent scaling law, is that currently no method (including the invariant Lie-group method) exists to establish a profound and at the same time an analytically accessible and correct connection between the deterministic and the statistical description of the wall-bounded Navier-Stokes theory.

Important to note is that up to now only in the specific case of homogeneous isotropic turbulence (Monin & Yaglom, 1975; Davidson, 2004; Sagaut & Cambon, 2008) all those invariant functional complexes which are gained from equivalence scaling groups can be further used to yield more valuable results, in particular the explicit values for the decay rates (as done e.g. in Oberlack (2002)), since one has exclusive access to additional nonlocal invariants such as the Birkhoff-Saffman or the Loitsyansky integral. However, for wall-bounded flows it is not clear yet how to use or exploit such invariant functional complexes in a meaningful way, since up to now no additional nonlocal invariants are known.

6. Non-compatibility with all LMN constraints

From a physical point of view the main difference between the MPC equations (1.2) and the LMN equations (1.16) is that the latter (up to the continuity constraints of incompressibility) come along with several additional natural (physical) constraints. Three of them are listed by (1.17), (1.18) and (1.19) to which any solution of (1.16) must be consistent with in order to be attributed as a physical solution. Hence, the symmetry transformations (1.20) and (1.21) must be consistent with these three constraints, otherwise physical solutions get mapped to unphysical ones.

In sections "D.1." and "D.2." of Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) the authors correctly show that both symmetries (1.20) and (1.21) are fully compatible with the normalization constraint (1.17) (up to the natural condition "(46)" for the arbitrary function ψ in (1.20)) and the coincidence constraint (1.18). At the same time, however, the authors create the wrong impression that in particular for symmetry transformation (1.20) the separation constraint (1.19) can actually be ignored for their purposes without consequences in realizing that this property "is never used in the derivation of the equations of the LMN hierarchy", and that it's "not satisfied by the corresponding symmetries of the MPC equations, either" (Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014), p. 6). But, from a physical point of view it should already be clear that the MPC equations are not the appropriate reference to make such a conclusion since they exhibit a fundamental disadvantage over the LMN equations when performing an invariance analysis upon them, in particular as the MPC system is *not* equivalent to the LMN system (see discussion in Section 3).

On the other side, for symmetry transformation (1.21) they misleadingly give a proof that for a *certain specification* of the PDF this symmetry is compatible with the separation constraint (1.19). But, this proof given in (1.22) is a *tautology*: By specifying the PDF f_n as the spatially independent and zero-valued δ-function $f_n = \delta(\mathbf{v}_{(1)}) \cdots \delta(\mathbf{v}_{(n)})$, the symmetry transformation (1.21) leads to the expression $f_n^* = f_n$, i.e. this particular specification turns the symmetry (1.21) into a trivial identity transformation, which, of course in a trivial manner, is always compatible to any thinkable constraint, also to the separation constraint (1.19). Obviously, formulation (1.22) thus does not constitute a proof-by-example that symmetry (1.21) is compatible to constraint (1.19), nor does it form a mathematical proof per se since it obviously is not covering the remaining infinite set of all other functional specifications for a possible PDF. But if, then it can be readily recognized that the above tautological specification of a trivial zero-valued δ-function for f_n is in effect the only possible PDF-specification which allows for such a compatibility.

Hence, their interpretation on the non-compatibility of symmetry (1.20) and their proof-by-example on the compatibility of symmetry (1.21) regarding the separation constraint (1.19) is misleading. The authors in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) should face the fact that both symmetry transformations (1.20) and (1.21) are, without exceptions, *incompatible* with the separation constraint (1.19), and that they thus violate one of the most intuitive physical constraints of the LMN equations (1.16)[†]: For *all times* every PDF solution should show the spatial property of statistical independence when any two points are infinitely far apart, that is, any two infinitely distant points should not influence each other. But exactly this property cannot be constantly maintained when transforming the system's variables according to (1.20) or (1.21). The reason is that since both transformations are true symmetry transformations which map solutions to new solutions of the underlying (*formally* closed) equations (1.16), and since both at the same time are not compatible with the third physical constraint (1.19), we thus obtain the unwanted effect that an initially physical solution can get mapped to an unphysical solution in which a non-vanishing correlation between infinitely distant points will be induced, and this for all times since the transformations (1.20) and (1.21) do not depend on time. This is definitely not physical and even is strictly avoided in every PDF-modelling technique (see e.g. Pope (2000); Wilczek (2010)).

Note that both symmetry transformations (1.20) and (1.21) can also not be interpreted as a valid approximation for moderate separations when the separation constraint (1.19) is violated, as it was done by the authors in their preceding work (Staffolani *et al.*, 2014), in particular for symmetry (1.20). This is due to the fact that every joint-PDF (f_n for $n \geq 2$) is a spatially connected quantity, meaning that if it does not show the correct behavior for large separations, there is no guarantee that the same PDF will then show a realistic or physical behavior for moderate separations. This situation can be formally compared to a

[†]Note that although both transformations (1.20) and (1.21) act spatially independent, the spatial limit of constraint (1.19) nevertheless induces a separation also in the sampled velocity values $\mathbf{v}_{(n)}$, hence, (1.19) imposes an *active* physical constraint on *both* symmetries (1.20) and (1.21).

boundary value problem for a differential equation with at least one infinite extension, in that, if the boundary condition at infinity is not satisfied, it will effect the solution in the whole domain. In this sense both symmetries (1.20) and (1.21) are unphysical and only turn into physical transformations if they also satisfy the separation constraint, but which, however, can only be achieved if $\psi = 0$ and $a_s = 0$. Hence, the separation constraint (1.19) ultimately breaks the LMN symmetries (1.20) and (1.21) in a non-approximative manner, and, thus, should not be used for any further conclusions as it was incorrectly done in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) e.g. when constructing the invariant scaling law (1.30).

For completeness, the reader should note that besides the three usually mentioned LMN constraints (up to those based on the continuity constraint), as 'normalization' (1.17), 'coincidence' (1.18) and 'separation' (1.19), there exists a fourth constraint which unfortunately is not mentioned anymore in the recent literature, as e.g. in Friedrich *et al.* (2012). We are talking about the additional constraint first derived in Ievlev (1970) (listed therein as constraint (2.6)), and also presented in Monin & Yaglom (1975) as constraint (19.139). Both LMN symmetries (1.20) and (1.21) are compatible however with this fourth constraint.

7. On the new "shape symmetry" in channel flow

In the course of deriving the restrictions (1.28) for the group parameters of the invariance (1.12) being induced by the symmetry (1.20) (see second part of section "D.1."), the authors in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) address the particular case of a fully developed plane Poiseuille channel flow, with the result that this so-called "shape symmetry" (1.20) in channel flow will take the form (1.24). However, if we do not pose any further restrictions on the functional structure of ψ, this adapted transformation (1.24) is no longer a symmetry transformation anymore (see Appendix B for proof), that is, transformation (1.24) in its general form does not leave the LMN equations (1.16) unchanged. Furthermore, transformation (1.24) even induces an inconsistency on the level of the MPC equations when transforming them according to (1.27) as an invariant (equivalence) transformation.[†]

This inconsistency can be easily exposed by recognizing the feature that the LMN equations (1.16) follow from a derivation of the deterministic (instantaneous) incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in which the pressure field $P = P(\mathbf{x}, t)$ has been eliminated by the continuity equation (see e.g. Lundgren (1967)). For a spatially unbounded or unconfined domain, the pressure field obeys the non-local relation (see e.g. McComb (1990))

$$P = \int d\mathbf{x}' \frac{1}{4\pi|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'|} \left(\nabla' \otimes \nabla'\right) \cdot \left(\mathbf{U}' \otimes \mathbf{U}'\right), \tag{7.1}$$

i.e. the dynamics of the pressure field is dictated by the velocity field $\mathbf{U}' = \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}', t)$. When taking in (7.1) the ensemble average and transform it according to (1.27) for the second moment of the *one-point* velocity fields, we obtain the following *invariant* transformation relation for the mean pressure:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle P \rangle &= \int d\mathbf{x}' \frac{1}{4\pi|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'|} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x'^i \partial x'^j} \langle U'^i U'^j \rangle \\
&= \int d\mathbf{x}' \frac{1}{4\pi|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'|} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x'^i \partial x'^j} \left[\langle U'^i U'^j \rangle^* - \delta^{1i}\delta^{1j} \cdot C_{11} \left(1 - \frac{y'^2}{H^2}\right)^2 \right] \\
&= \int d\mathbf{x}' \frac{1}{4\pi|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'|} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x'^i \partial x'^j} \langle U'^i U'^j \rangle^* \\
&= \langle P \rangle^* ,
\end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

[†]Note that it's incorrect to identify (1.27) as a symmetry transformation; at most it may only be identified as an equivalence transformation due to the unclosed nature of the MPC equations (see discussion of Section 3 & 4).

where $y' = x_2' = (x'^2)$ is the wall-normal integration coordinate. Note that (1.27) is only a translation in the field variables, while the coordinates and thus also the integration coordinates stay invariant, i.e. $\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{x}'^* = \mathbf{x}'$, respectively.

However, on the other hand, if we consider the ensemble-averaged instantaneous one-point velocity equations up to first moment (Pope, 2000; Davidson, 2004)

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \partial_i \langle U^i \rangle = 0, \\ \partial_t \langle U^i \rangle + \partial_j \langle U^i U^j \rangle = -\delta^{ij} \partial_j \langle P \rangle + \nu \Delta \langle U^i \rangle, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{7.3}$$

being just the continuity and the mean momentum equations resulting from the MPC hierarchy (1.2)-(1.4) within the one-point limit $\mathbf{x}_{(n)} \to \mathbf{x}_{(1)} = \mathbf{x}$ for all $n \geq 2$, and transform them according to (1.27)

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \partial_i \langle U^i \rangle^* = 0, \\ \partial_t \langle U^i \rangle^* + \partial_j \langle U^i U^j \rangle^* = -\delta^{ij} \partial_j \langle P \rangle + \nu \Delta \langle U^i \rangle^* + \delta^{1i} \frac{2\nu C_1}{H^2}, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{7.4}$$

we obtain the following transformation relation for the mean pressure field

$$\langle P \rangle = \langle P \rangle^* + \delta_{1k} x^k \frac{2\nu C_1}{H^2}, \tag{7.5}$$

if and only if we would demand invariance of the above momentum equation as imposed by the authors in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014). But (7.5) stands in contradiction to the transformation $\langle P \rangle = \langle P \rangle^*$ as demanded by expression (7.2). Hence (1.27) cannot be identified as an invariant (equivalence) transformation of the MPC equations (1.2). If it would, it will only lead to an inconsistency. Therefore, (1.27) may not be used to construct an invariant function which is linked to the LMN equations, i.e. (1.27) may not enter expression (1.29) as it was done in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014).

The reason for this failure, in that (1.24) is not a symmetry of the underlying LMN equations (1.16) anymore, already lies in the equational structure of the LMN hierarchy itself. While system (1.16) by construction only applies for spatially *unbounded* flows, the authors in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014), however, consider PDFs for *bounded* flows by using particularly the expression (1.23) of a fully developed laminar channel flow (including its boundary region at $y = \pm H$) in order to convert their "shape symmetry" (1.20) into the form (1.24). A loss of symmetry is thus the consequence. Because, when formally removing the boundary condition again, in letting $H \to \infty$, will not only restore the consistency between both transformations (7.2) and (7.5) (since the latter transformation will merge into the relation $\langle P \rangle = \langle P \rangle^*$ of the former one), but will also turn transformation (1.24) back into the symmetry (1.20) again (since for finite values of the wall-normal coordinate the symmetry-breaking factors in (1.24) will neutralize to $F = 1$ and $\mathbf{v}' = \mathbf{v}$).

Hence, in order to properly address PDFs for *bounded* flows, the LMN hierarchy must be completely re-derived such as to incorporate the considered boundary conditions into the integro-differential equations. This can be achieved for example by using the image method for Green's functions (see e.g. Feynman *et al.* (1963); Jackson (1998)). However, this will result into a fundamentally different functional form of equations than given by the hierarchy (1.16), which only applies for unbounded flows, and to the best of our knowledge such PDF evolution equations for bounded flows have not been derived yet. But if, then it's also straightforward to show that the adapted "shape symmetry" (1.24) is not admitted as a symmetry transformation by the bounded LMN equations for plane channel flow either. This can be actually shown without explicitly deriving these complex LMN equations for bounded flows.

Because, first of all, when including any specific boundaries, the induced inconsistency presented within (7.1)-(7.5) is maintained, which already is a clear indication that the PDF "shape symmetry" (1.24) itself is not admitted as a symmetry by the corresponding bounded LMN equations. Of course, this can also be proven directly by investigating the invariance

characteristics of all relevant boundary terms contributing to the LMN equations. This will be done in the second part of this investigation. Now, for a streamwise pressure driven plane channel flow, the instantaneous Navier-Stokes equations can be formulated as

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \partial_i U^i &= 0, \\ \partial_t U^i + \partial_j (U^i U^j) &= -\delta^{ij}\partial_j P + \nu \Delta U^i + \delta^{1i} K, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{7.6}$$

where K is a constant pressure gradient to drive the flow. These equations (7.6) can then be formally solved for the instantaneous pressure field P (see e.g. McComb (1990)).[†] Since the velocity field $\mathbf{U}$ is restricted to be zero at the (wall) boundary, the solution reads

$$\begin{aligned} P = \int_V d^3\mathbf{x}'\, G(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{x}')\ (\nabla' \otimes \nabla') \cdot (\mathbf{U}' \otimes \mathbf{U}') \\ - \nu \int_S d^2\mathbf{x}'\, G(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{x}')\, \mathbf{n}' \cdot \Big[\, (\mathbf{n}' \otimes \mathbf{n}') \cdot (\nabla' \otimes \nabla')\, \mathbf{U}' \Big], \end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

with the Green's function for a plane channel width of $2H > 0$ given as (Polyanin, 2002)

$$G(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{x}') \equiv G(x-x';y,y';z-z') = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{r_{1,n}} + \frac{1}{r_{2,n}} \right), \tag{7.8}$$

where

$$r_{k,n} = \sqrt{(x-x')^2 + (y + (-1)^k y' + 2(k-1)H - 4nH)^2 + (z-z')^2}, \qquad k = 1,2, \tag{7.9}$$

and, where $\mathbf{n}' = \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}')$ in (7.7) is the unit inward normal vector at $\mathbf{x}'$ on the surface (boundary) $S = \partial V$ of the flow volume V, which, however, for the considered plane channel flow just reduces to $\mathbf{n}' = (0, \pm 1, 0)$ for the lower and upper plate respectively.[‡]

Now, by transforming the mean field equations of (7.6) according to (1.27), we will yield

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \partial_i \langle U^i \rangle^* &= 0, \\ \partial_t \langle U^i \rangle^* + \partial_j \langle U^i U^j \rangle^* &= -\delta^{ij}\partial_j \langle P \rangle + \nu \Delta \langle U^i \rangle^* + \delta^{1i} K + \delta^{1i} \frac{2\nu C_1}{H^2}, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{7.10}$$

while when transforming the corresponding mean pressure $\langle P \rangle$ of the solution (7.7), we will obtain *again* the invariant result $\langle P \rangle = \langle P \rangle^*$ as in (7.2), simply due to the effect that for plane channel flow the wall-normal vector is always orthogonal to the pure streamwise transformation (1.27), i.e. in due to having the particular invariance $\mathbf{n}' \cdot \langle \mathbf{U}' \rangle = \mathbf{n}' \cdot \langle \mathbf{U}' \rangle^*$. Hence, again, in order to achieve invariance of the above momentum equation (7.10), the mean pressure field has to transform as (7.5), but which, as before in the unbounded case, stands in conflict with the invariant transformation relation (7.2) when given through its corresponding (now bounded) solution (7.7).

This transformational inconsistency in the equations for the moments can also be viewed from a different perspective. Instead of taking a fixed specific value K for the constant pressure gradient in (7.6), we can alternatively treat it also as a random but still *constant* quantity. For example, we can re-formulate (7.6) as

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \partial_i U^i &= 0, \\ \partial_t U^i + \partial_j (U^i U^j) &= -\delta^{ij}\partial_j P + \nu \Delta U^i + \kappa \frac{2\nu U_0}{H^2} \delta^{1i}, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{7.11}$$

where $H > 0$ is the channel half-height, U_0 a given constant (random) velocity scale, e.g. the velocity in the middle of the streamwise centerline $U_0 := U^1(\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}, t = t_0)$ evaluated at a certain time $t = t_0$ at some fixed point in the past $0 \le t_0 < t$, and κ a dimensionless number

[†]Note that the pressure P in (7.6) is an effective field with the mean field property $\partial_x \langle P \rangle = 0$. In solving this system (7.6) to obtain solution (7.7), we formally assume periodic boundary conditions for $\mathbf{U}$ and ∇P in the two homogeneous directions of the plane channel with the corresponding boundaries lying at infinity.

[‡]As in the fully unbounded solution (7.1), note that also the Green function (7.8) in the bounded solution (7.7) is normalized as $\Delta G(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{x}') = -\delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}')$. Further note that the surface integral in (7.7) can only give a contribution at the wall boundaries, since the surface contributions at the (infinite far) boundaries in the two homogeneous directions cancel each other pairwise.

characterizing the constant pressure gradient K to drive the flow *independently* from the pre-set internal velocity scale U_0. Now, when transforming the ensemble averaged equations of (7.11) for fixed κ over an ensemble of different U_0 according to (1.27), we will yield

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \partial_i\langle U^i\rangle^* &= 0, \\ \partial_t\langle U^i\rangle^* + \partial_j\langle U^iU^j\rangle^* &= -\delta^{ij}\partial_j\langle P\rangle + \nu\Delta\langle U^i\rangle^* + \kappa\frac{2\nu\langle U_0\rangle^*}{H^2}\delta^{1i} + \delta^{1i}\frac{2\nu C_1}{H^2}(1-\kappa). \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{7.12}$$

Hence, for $C_1 \neq 0$ the mean momentum equation in (7.12) is only invariant in the singular case when $\kappa = 1$, i.e. when the flow is driven by a constant streamwise pressure gradient which is just finely tuned to the particular (non-random) value $K = 2\nu\langle U_0\rangle/H^2$, but which, by itself, practically only represents a hypothetical and thus non-usable quantity, simply because its value $\langle U_0\rangle$ is not known beforehand. But anyhow, despite this single invariant yet non-realizable case, the invariance in general is clearly broken for all other pressure gradients where $\kappa \neq 1$, and, as discussed before, will automatically induce an inconsistency in the mean pressure transformation as soon as any invariance in (7.12) is enforced.

At this stage it should be clear already that the above shown inconsistency is actually rooted in the fact that the PDF "shape symmetry" (1.24) is not admitted as a symmetry by the corresponding bounded LMN equations. Indeed, when transcribing the pressure surface term in (7.7) into the LMN formalism (see e.g. Lundgren (1967)), we will additionally obtain inside the square brackets on the right-hand side of the original (unbounded) LMN equations (1.16) the following surface (boundary) term[†]

$$\nu\int_S d^2\mathbf{x}_{(n+1)}\left(\nabla_{(j)}\,G(\mathbf{x}_{(j)},\mathbf{x}_{(n+1)})\right)\mathbf{n}_{(n+1)}\cdot\left(\mathbf{n}_{(n+1)}\cdot\nabla_{(n+1)}\right)^2\int d\mathbf{v}_{(n+1)}\mathbf{v}_{(n+1)}f_{n+1}, \tag{7.13}$$

and, as this term will be the only viscosity-dependent modification in the LMN equations (1.16) for unbounded flows, it will extend the viscous part in (B.3) of our proof accordingly. But, since the above term in the square bracket already vanishes on the lowest level of order $n = 1$ when specifying $f_2 = \widehat{f}_2$ (B.1), i.e. since we do not get any contributions from the above surface term (7.13) for plane channel flow, all argumentations and conclusions of the proof as given in Appendix B remain valid, also for the LMN equations of bounded flows, in particular for plane channel flow. Hence, the adapted "shape symmetry" (1.24) is not a symmetry transformation of the LMN equations, neither for unbounded flows nor for the bounded plane channel flow. The consequence of this expected result: Since the transformation (1.24) is *not* a symmetry of the underlying statistical system, it thus may *not* be used to generate invariant functions, neither on the level of the PDFs themselves, nor on the lower level of the induced moments. In the latter case, as it was shown before, the transformation (1.24) even induces a non-removable inconsistency in the transformation behavior of the mean pressure field. Hence, identifying the transformation (1.27) as the induced symmetry from (1.24) to then generate the invariant function (1.30), as was done in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014), is therefore wrong and will only produce inconsistent results.

8. The non-connectedness to random Galilean invariance

The authors in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) identify their statistical transformation group (1.14) as the random Galilean group, first introduced by Kraichnan (1965). However, this identification is not correct; the translation group (1.14) in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) is not in conformance with the random Galilean group as defined by Kraichnan. The simple reason is that the random Galilean group acts on the fine-grained (fluctuating) level, while the statistical translation group (1.14) exclusively only acts on the coarse-grained (averaged) level without having a cause on the lower fluctuating level; a property which itself is unphysical since it obviously violates the classical principle of causality (see Section 2).

[†] In (7.13), the element $\mathbf{n}_{(n+1)}$ is defined as the inward normal vector at point $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_{(n+1)}$ on the surface S. For the considered plane channel flow, however, these vectors $\mathbf{n}_{(n+1)} = \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}_{(n+1)}) \equiv \mathbf{n}$ are constants for all $n \geq 1$, in only taking the two values $\mathbf{n} = (0, \pm 1, 0)$; see explanation in previous footnote.

To prove this statement of non-conformance, it is necessary to define the random Galilean group (see also McComb (2014) for a recent introduction into this concept). It emerges from the usual deterministic Galilean transformation, which, up to a shift in time and static rotations, i.e. only in the form of a time-invariant boost, is given by

$$\mathsf{G}: \; t^* = t, \;\; \mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{V} \cdot t, \;\; \mathbf{U}^* = \mathbf{U} + \mathbf{V}, \;\; P^* = P, \tag{8.1}$$

where $\mathbf{V}$ is the velocity shift constant in time and space. Since $\mathbf{U}$ represents the instantaneous and thus fluctuating velocity field, one has two ways now in how to turn G into a physical statistical transformation.

Method No.1: If one defines $\mathbf{V}$ as a non-fluctuating, i.e. as a non-random constant variable with a statistically sharp ensemble average $\langle \mathbf{V} \rangle = \mathbf{V}$, then, taking the ensemble average of (8.1) will give the classical Galilean transformation in statistical form

$$\langle \mathsf{G} \rangle_1: \quad t^* = t, \quad \mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{V} \cdot t, \quad \langle \mathbf{U} \rangle^* = \langle \mathbf{U} \rangle + \mathbf{V}, \quad \langle P \rangle^* = P, \tag{8.2}$$

which coincides with the classical statistical symmetry (1.10) in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) when choosing $\mathbf{f}(t) = \mathbf{V} \cdot t$.

Method No.2: If one defines $\mathbf{V}$ as a fluctuating, i.e. as random constant variable with ensemble average $\langle \mathbf{V} \rangle$, then, taking again the ensemble average of (8.1) will give the random Galilean transformation

$$\langle \mathsf{G} \rangle_2: \quad t^* = t, \quad \mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{V} \cdot t, \quad \langle \mathbf{U} \rangle^* = \langle \mathbf{U} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{V} \rangle, \quad \langle P \rangle^* = P, \tag{8.3}$$

where Kraichnan (1965) chose $\mathbf{V}$ with a Gaussian distribution having zero mean $\langle \mathbf{V} \rangle = \mathbf{0}$. But, also for any other distribution with a non-zero mean $\langle \mathbf{V} \rangle \neq \mathbf{0}$, the random Galilean transformation (8.3) is not connected in any form to transformation (1.14) as claimed in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014). Firstly, the spatial coordinates in (8.3) get transformed and do *not* stay unchanged as in (1.14) (even in the Kraichnan specification $\langle \mathbf{V} \rangle = \mathbf{0}$, the spatial coordinates get transformed), and secondly, the transformation rule for all n-point velocity correlations beyond the mean velocity, i.e. for all $n \geq 2$, do not transform invariantly as given by (1.14), if we consistently identify the non-vanishing and *constant* shift $\mathbf{C}_{\{1\}}$ of (1.14) as the *independent* shift $\langle \mathbf{V} \rangle = \mathbf{C}_{\{1\}} \neq 0$ of the random Galilean transformation (8.3). Because, by already considering the transformation rule for the 2-point velocity correlation $\mathbf{H}_{\{2\}}$ based on the underlying instantaneous Galilean transformation (8.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}^*_{\{2\}} &= \langle \mathbf{U}^*_{(1)} \otimes \mathbf{U}^*_{(2)} \rangle = \langle (\mathbf{U}_{(1)} + \mathbf{V}) \otimes (\mathbf{U}_{(2)} + \mathbf{V}) \rangle \\ &= \mathbf{H}_{\{2\}} + \left(\mathbf{H}^{(1)}_{\{1\}} + \mathbf{H}^{(2)}_{\{1\}} \right) \otimes \mathbf{C}_{\{1\}} + \langle \mathbf{V} \otimes \mathbf{V} \rangle, \\ &\neq \mathbf{H}_{\{2\}}, \end{aligned} \tag{8.4}$$

one manifestly recognizes that transformation (1.14) is not compatible with the random Galilean transformation as proposed by Kraichnan (1965), not even in a more general sense which goes beyond a Gaussian distribution with zero mean.

9. On capturing intermittency with global symmetries

In our opinion, the method of Lie-groups, when used as a constructive method to generate scaling laws in particular from *global* symmetry transformations, is not the appropriate method to capture the complex spatiotemporal phenomenon of intermittency in dynamical systems, irrespective of whether internal (small scale) or external (large scale) intermittency is considered. Intermittency is generally characterized by sporadic bursts in specific physical quantities with non-Gaussian probabilities, and, in general, is itself a property which rather breaks than restores symmetries, not only on the fine-grained (fluctuating) level but also on the coarse-grained (averaged) level (Tsinober, 2013; Saint-Michel *et al.*, 2013; Castellani, 2003; Kurths & Pikovsky, 1995; Frisch, 1985).

A prominent historical example is the failure of Kolmogorov's K41-theory (Kolmogorov, 1941*a*,*b*,*c*), which has been found to be increasingly inaccurate for higher order statistics (see e.g. Frisch (1995); Biferale *et al.* (2003)). Instead of statistically restoring the deterministic scaling symmetry of the Navier-Stokes system (Fushchich *et al.*, 1993; Frisch, 1995; Andreev *et al.*, 1998), an induced turbulent flow will always statistically evolve such by showing the property of anomalous scaling and the breaking of global self-similarity, which both interdependently can be attributed to the complex property of intermittency (Frisch, 1985, 1995; Biferale *et al.*, 2003).

Although this example only addresses the effect of global symmetry breaking in the process of internal intermittency, it nevertheless serves as a representative example for any type of intermittency. In our opinion, this effect of global symmetry breaking will be even more pronounced for external intermittency than for internal intermittency, which consequently will have a strong negative impact on the overall performance of the so-called global "intermittency symmetry" (1.21) in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014), which again aims at describing external intermittent flows. The reason for this pronounced effect is that in contrast to the "more simpler" process of internal intermittency, which more or less can be regarded as a *universal* process acting independently from boundary conditions and which thus simply manifests itself in *all* turbulent flows, the "more complex" external intermittency is a *non-universal* process which predominately results from the interaction between the flow and externally imposed boundary conditions. And since it's well-known that boundary conditions are generally obstructive to global symmetries, the mechanism of symmetry breaking will thus be more strongly favored for external (non-universal large scale) intermittency than it already is for internal (universal small scale) intermittency.

The point is that even if we would only consider a homogeneous isotropic turbulent flow (which is a highly idealized flow), the statistical solutions, in particular the higher order correlations, are by far more complicated than we currently can imagine and that it's actually unrealistic to believe that this complicated behavior can be captured by some *global* scaling symmetries. The complexity even increases when considering wall-bounded flows. Hence, proposing (1.30) as a "solution" to the intermittent scaling behavior of the wall-bounded plane channel flow as done by the authors in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014), it's highly questionable if this is really the case when (1.30) is matched to numerical or physical experiments, and, furthermore, whether (1.30) is really consistent also to all higher order moments when trying to involve them accordingly.

Despite the fact that this scaling law (1.30) is based on two unphysical invariant transformations (1.12) and (1.13) violating the fundamental principle of causality of classical mechanics (as shown in Section 2), and besides the fact that they respectively emerge from two symmetries (1.20) and (1.21) which must get broken in order to be compatible with all constraints of the underlying dynamical equations (as shown in Section 6), making thus (1.30) as a scaling law totally unreliable, the further and more general problem is that the deterministic Navier-Stokes theory itself, unfortunately, only allows for spatially *global* symmetries and not for spatially *local symmetries*[†]: All symmetries of the deterministic Euler and Navier-Stokes equations listed in (1.6)-(1.11) are only *spatially global* symmetries. No other, more general symmetries for this theory exist or are known yet. And it's exactly due to this fact, that a Lie-group based symmetry analysis for the unclosed statistical Navier-Stokes theory didn't achieve the same great breakthrough as it did, e.g., for the theory of quantum fields (see e.g. Weinberg (2000); Penrose (2005)), which is based on a spatially local symmetry, the local gauge symmetry which successfully predicts the unknown functional structure of the interacting fields between the various elementary particles.

[†]A *global* symmetry of a physical system is associated with a *finite* dimensional Lie-group in which all group parameters are strict constants. On the other hand, a *local* symmetry is associated with an *infinite* dimensional Lie-group in which at least one group parameter is not constant, e.g. by showing a space-time coordinate dependence of the considered system. Most physical processes, however, only admit spatially global symmetries since the requirement for a spatially local symmetry is too restrictive. But, linear quantum theory is such a prominent example which admits a spatially local scaling (gauge) symmetry.

Appendix A. Comments to Proof No.1

Taken one-to-one from Frewer *et al.* (2014), the proof (2.2) reads[†]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{H}_1^* = e^{a_s}\mathbf{H}_1 \;&\Rightarrow\; \langle \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_1^*, t^*)\rangle = e^{a_s}\langle \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_1, t)\rangle, \text{ for all points } \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x} && \text{(A.1)}\\
&\Rightarrow\; \langle \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_k^*, t^*)\rangle = e^{a_s}\langle \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_k, t)\rangle, \text{ for all } k \geq 1 && \text{(A.2)}\\
&\Rightarrow\; \langle \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_k^*, t^*)\rangle = \langle e^{a_s}\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_k, t)\rangle, \text{ for all possible configurations } \mathbf{U} && \text{(A.3)}\\
&\Rightarrow\; \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_k^*, t^*) = e^{a_s}\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_k, t) && \text{(A.4)}\\
&\Rightarrow\; \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_1^*, t^*) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_n^*, t^*) = e^{n\cdot a_s}\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_1, t) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_n, t) && \text{(A.5)}\\
&\Rightarrow\; \langle \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_1^*, t^*) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_n^*, t^*)\rangle = \langle e^{n\cdot a_s}\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_1, t) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_n, t)\rangle && \text{(A.6)}\\
&\Rightarrow\; \langle \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_1^*, t^*) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_n^*, t^*)\rangle = e^{n\cdot a_s}\langle \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_1, t) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_n, t)\rangle && \text{(A.7)}\\
&\Rightarrow\; \mathbf{H}_n^* = e^{n\cdot a_s}\mathbf{H}_n. && \text{(A.8)}
\end{aligned}$$

A.1. *Comment No.1*

In (A.1) we identify the expression $\mathbf{H}_1^* = \langle \mathbf{U}_1\rangle^*$ as $\langle \mathbf{U}_1^*\rangle := \langle \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_1^*, t^*)\rangle$. This conclusion is based on the simple fact that the transformation of $\mathbf{H}_1^*$ is a trivial one, in which all values of $\mathbf{H}_1$ just get globally scaled by a constant factor e^{a_s}.

In the *general case*, however, a careful distinction must be made between the two transformed expressions $\langle \mathbf{U}\rangle^*$ and $\langle \mathbf{U}^*\rangle$, since the former directly refers to the transformed mean velocity field while the latter refers to the transformed instantaneous (fluctuating) velocity field which is then averaged, and thus, *in general*, is mathematically distinct from the former expression. But here we are not considering the case of such a *general* variable (point) transformation

$$t^* = t^*\,(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{H}_l), \quad \mathbf{x}_n^* = \mathbf{x}_n^*(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{H}_l), \quad \mathbf{H}_n^* = \mathbf{H}_n^*(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{H}_l), \quad (k, l) \leq n, \tag{A.9}$$

between the independent variables $(t, \mathbf{x}_n)$ and the dependent variables $\mathbf{H}_n$, but only, as given by (1.13), the far more simpler *specific case* of a globally uniform scaling in the dependent variables

$$t^* = t, \quad \mathbf{x}_n^* = \mathbf{x}_n, \quad \mathbf{H}_n^* = e^{a_s}\mathbf{H}_n, \tag{A.10}$$

which, when written for example for the one-point moment at $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}$

$$t^* = t, \quad \mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{x}, \quad \langle \mathbf{U}\rangle^* = e^{a_s}\langle \mathbf{U}\rangle, \tag{A.11}$$

acts as a trivial subset of (A.9). Note that in the following we only investigate the mathematical property of the transformation (A.11) *itself*, i.e. whether it additionally represents an equational invariance or not is irrelevant. In other words, we will investigate (A.11) very generally, solely as a transformation of variables detached from any underlying transport equations.

Now, it is straightforward to recognize that particularly in this trivial case (A.11), the two above mentioned transformed one-point expressions $\mathbf{H}_1^* = \langle \mathbf{U}\rangle^*$ and $\langle \mathbf{U}^*\rangle$ are identical

$$\langle \mathbf{U}\rangle^* \equiv \langle \mathbf{U}^*\rangle. \tag{A.12}$$

This conclusion is based on the following argument, in that we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{H}_1^* = e^{a_s}\mathbf{H}_1 \;\Leftrightarrow\; \langle \mathbf{U}\rangle^* &= e^{a_s}\langle \mathbf{U}\rangle && \text{(A.13)}\\
&= \langle e^{a_s}\mathbf{U}\rangle && \text{(A.14)}\\
&\underset{\text{def.}}{=:} \langle \widehat{\mathbf{U}}\rangle, && \text{(A.15)}
\end{aligned}$$

[†]For a better readability we will drop in this section the redundant bracket-notation, i.e. instead of $\mathbf{H}_{\{n\}}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{(n)}$ we will write $\mathbf{H}_n$ and $\mathbf{x}_n$ respectively.

due to the fact that any constant factor as e^{a_s} commutes with every averaging operator $\langle,\rangle$. Hence one is able to define a unique transformation relation $\mathbf{U} \to \widehat{\mathbf{U}}$ on the instantaneous level having the *same* transformational structure

$$\widehat{\mathbf{U}} = e^{a_s}\mathbf{U}, \tag{A.16}$$

as its averaged value given in (A.11), namely a simple multiplication of a constant factor e^{a_s} on some field values[†]. This, then, uniquely allows us to identify

$$\widehat{\mathbf{U}} = \mathbf{U}^*. \tag{A.17}$$

In other words, since the symbol $\widehat{\mathbf{U}}$ on the left-hand side of (A.16) is defined by the mathematical operation on the right-hand side (a simple multiplication of a constant factor e^{a_s}), and since this mathematical operation is exactly identical to the right-hand side of the initial transformation (A.11), one can therefore uniquely identify the transformed symbol on the left-hand side of (A.16) with the same transformation symbol as it's used on the left-hand side of (A.11), i.e. $\widehat{\ } = {}^*$.

Again, the reason is that (A.11) and (A.16) show exactly the same transformation structure on their right-hand sides, namely a simple multiplication of a constant factor e^{a_s} on some field values, which then define their left-hand sides. But since we are dealing here with the same transformational process in (A.16) as in (A.11), we should also explicitly display it, namely by using $\mathbf{U}^*$ and not $\widehat{\mathbf{U}}$, which would only unnecessarily overload the notation. Exactly this fact was implicitly assumed when writing the first conclusion in (2.2).

But, as soon as we would consider a more complicated transformation than (A.11), as for example

$$t^* = t, \quad \mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{x}, \quad \langle\mathbf{U}\rangle^* = e^{a_s(\mathbf{x})}\langle\mathbf{U}\rangle, \tag{A.18}$$

where, instead of a globally constant scaling exponent a_s, we now would have a *local* scaling exponent $a_s(\mathbf{x})$ which explicitly depends on the spatial coordinates, the identification (A.12), of course, generally no longer holds and becomes invalid. The reason simply is that in contrast to (A.11) the scaling factor in (A.18) is no longer a global constant anymore which can commute with every averaging operator $\langle,\rangle$. In other words, since generally

$$\langle\mathbf{U}\rangle^* = e^{a_s(\mathbf{x})}\langle\mathbf{U}\rangle \neq \langle e^{a_s(\mathbf{x})}\mathbf{U}\rangle, \tag{A.19}$$

we are no longer able to define a corresponding transformation relation $\mathbf{U} \to \mathbf{U}^*$ on the instantaneous level which has the *same* transformational structure as its averaged value (A.18). On the contrary, its *real* corresponding transformation rule $\mathbf{U} \to \mathbf{U}^{**}$ will rather show a far more complex functional structure than given by (A.18), which in the first instance also cannot be mathematically determined in a straightforward manner.

Hence, since the situation of proof (2.2) is not dealing with a complex situation like (A.18), but only with a trivial one as (A.11), the notation used throughout (2.2) is correct and not misleading.

Note that already from an intuitive point of view the identification (A.12) must be valid if we consider a simple transformation as (A.11). Because, since in (A.11) only the field values and not the coordinates get transformed we can perform the following thought experiment: Imagine we have an ensemble of DNS results for the instantaneous velocity field $\mathbf{U}$ (hereby it is irrelevant from which specific equations this data set was numerically generated). From the field $\mathbf{U}$ we now construct the mean field $\langle\mathbf{U}\rangle$ (either as an ensemble average over a set of different $\mathbf{U}$, or, if we have a statistically homogenous direction, over an integral of a single $\mathbf{U}$ in this direction). Thus we then obtain all functional values of $\langle\mathbf{U}\rangle$,

[†]Note that if (A.11) would be additionally admitted as a symmetry of some mean field transport equations, then we may *not* conclude that (A.16) is a symmetry, too, of the underlying instantaneous (fluctuating) equations. Because, on the mean field level one can have a symmetric structure which on the fluctuating level must not exist.

which we now collectively multiply with a same constant factor, say by $e^{a_s} = 2$, to get the new transformed values $\langle \mathbf{U} \rangle^*$ of (A.11).

Now, the critical question: How should the underlying DNS data for the instantaneous field $\mathbf{U}$ be transformed in order to generate with the same corresponding averaging process the just previously constructed values $\langle \mathbf{U} \rangle^*$? The intuitive and correct answer is that all DNS data must be *coherently* multiplied with the same factor $e^{a_s} = 2$. Only then will the new transformed data $\mathbf{U}^*$, if it emerges from the operation $\mathbf{U}^* := 2 \cdot \mathbf{U}$ and if it's correspondingly averaged to $\langle \mathbf{U}^* \rangle$, give the ability to reconstruct the functional values $\langle \mathbf{U} \rangle^*$. Since there is no other option, we hence obtain within this process the unique result $\langle \mathbf{U}^* \rangle = \langle \mathbf{U} \rangle^*$. Of course, this reasoning is only valid for a global (coherent) transformation as given by (A.11); for a more complicated (local) transformation as (A.18) this reasoning no longer holds.

A.2. *Comment No.2*

The conclusion (A.4) is based on the relation (A.3) which goes along with the explicit comment that this relation, by definition, must hold for *all* possible configurations or functional realizations of the fluctuating velocity field $\mathbf{U}$, and not only for any certain functional specification $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}_0(\mathbf{x}, t)$. In this case, of course, conclusion (A.4) would *not* be correct, because for a certain specification $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}_0$, we generally have the situation that $\langle \mathbf{U}_0^* \rangle = \langle \mathbf{U}_0 \rangle$ although $\mathbf{U}_0^* \neq \mathbf{U}_0$.

Now, for the reason that (A.3) must hold for *all* possible configurations $\mathbf{U}$, it is important to recognize that (A.3) is not an equation to be solved for, but that it represents a definition. And exactly this is the argument when going from the third (A.3) to fourth line (A.4). The third line

$$\langle \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_k^*, t^*) \rangle = \langle e^{a_s} \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_k, t) \rangle, \tag{A.20}$$

does not stand for an equation but for a definition (as it's the case for any variable transformation in mathematics)

$$\langle \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_k^*, t^*) \rangle \underset{\text{def.}}{:=} \langle e^{a_s} \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_k, t) \rangle, \tag{A.21}$$

since the left-hand side (transformed side) is defined by the mathematical expression and operation given on the right-hand side. Now, since the right-hand side by definition must hold *for all* possible (functional) configurations of the instantaneous velocity field $\mathbf{U}$, and since both functions $e^{a_s}\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{U}^*$ undergo the *same* operation of averaging, we thus can only conclude that both functions themselves must be identical. In other words, definition (A.21) implies the definition

$$\mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_k^*, t^*) \underset{\text{def.}}{:=} e^{a_s} \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_k, t), \tag{A.22}$$

in that the transformed instantaneous velocity field $\mathbf{U}^*$ is defined by the expression $e^{a_s}\mathbf{U}$. This then gives the fourth line (A.4).

Two things should be noted here. Firstly, the above conclusion is similar to the arguments which are standardly used in fluid mechanics when deriving a differential conservation law from its corresponding integral version. The similarity is given in so far as the argument for the validity of the integral conservation law is also based on the requirement *"for all"*, however here, for *all* possible volumes or surfaces. Hence the integral operator from the integral conservation law can be dropped and the integrand itself is identified as the corresponding conservation law on the differential level.

Secondly, according to the arguments given in Comment No.1, we are not obliged to make the direct conclusion (A.4) from relation (A.3). Conclusion (A.4) can already be directly obtained from (A.1) by considering the result (A.17), i.e. we can directly conclude that

$$\mathbf{H}_1^* = e^{a_s} \mathbf{H}_1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_k^*, t^*) = e^{a_s} \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}_k, t), \tag{A.23}$$

which just explicitly expresses the fact again that result (A.17) was uniquely obtained (for all $\mathbf{x}_k$ within the physical space $\mathbf{x}$) as the induced transformation rule $\mathbf{U} \to \widehat{\mathbf{U}} = \mathbf{U}^*$ (the cause on the fluctuating level) from the transformation rule of the mean velocity $\mathbf{H}_1 \to \mathbf{H}_1^*$ (the effect on the averaged level).

A.3. *Comment No.3*

In (A.8) we identify the transformed n-point velocity correlation function $\mathbf{H}_n^*$ as the transformed expression $\langle \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_1^*, t^*) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_n^*, t^*) \rangle$. This is just the obvious consequence in knowing the fact that only from the transformed velocity field $\mathbf{U}^*$, as it is defined in (A.17) and thus in (A.4), *all* transformed correlation functions $\mathbf{H}_n^*$ can be uniquely defined and constructed without inducing contradictions and without violating the principle of causality. In other words, making the conclusion

$$\mathbf{H}_1^* = e^{a_s}\mathbf{H}_1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{H}_n^{*\prime} = e^{n \cdot a_s}\mathbf{H}_n, \tag{A.24}$$

where $\mathbf{H}_n^{*\prime}$ represents the mean product of n spatial coordinate evaluations of the transformed and for all points $\mathbf{x}_n$ unique instantaneous velocity field $\mathbf{U}^* = \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}^*, t^*)$, and in which it then gets identified as the transformed n-point correlation function $\mathbf{H}_n^*$, as done in (A.8),

$$\mathbf{H}_n^* := \mathbf{H}_n^{*\prime} = \langle \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_1^*, t^*) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{x}_n^*, t^*) \rangle, \tag{A.25}$$

is the *only* possible conclusion without running into any contractions and without violating the principle of cause and effect.

A.4. *Comment No.4*

Note that already from an intuitive point of view only the conclusion

$$\mathbf{H}_1^* = e^{a_s}\mathbf{H}_1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{H}_n^* = e^{n \cdot a_s}\mathbf{H}_n, \tag{A.26}$$

given through (A.1)-(A.8), makes physically sense, while the conclusion induced by (1.13), or (A.10)

$$\mathbf{H}_1^* = e^{a_s}\mathbf{H}_1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{H}_n^* = e^{a_s}\mathbf{H}_n, \tag{A.27}$$

is physically senseless. This can be seen for example by making again the following small thought experiment: Imagine we have the following arbitrary but fixed mean velocity profile $\mathbf{H}_1 = \langle \mathbf{U} \rangle$ based on some instantaneous (fluctuating) velocity field $\mathbf{U}$. Now, according to the left-hand side of (A.26) or (A.27), if we scale this mean profile $\mathbf{H}_1$ by, say, a constant factor $e^{a_s} = 2$, we will get the two times amplified mean velocity profile $\mathbf{H}_1^*$. Hereby it should be noted that this scaling is performed globally, i.e. for *all* points in the considered physical space $\mathbf{x}$ the mean velocity values $\mathbf{H}_1$ are scaled uniformly by a constant factor two.

Intuitively it's clear that a *globally* two times higher amplitude in the mean profile can only go along with a *globally* two times higher amplitude in the instantaneous velocity. In other words, in order to account for a global scaling $\mathbf{H}_1^* = 2\mathbf{H}_1$ on the averaged level (the effect), the underlying instantaneous velocity must transform accordingly $\mathbf{U}^* = 2\mathbf{U}$ on the fluctuating level (the cause), otherwise we would not manage to reproduce this coherent amplification of a factor two on the averaged level.

But now, if the instantaneous velocity $\mathbf{U}$ globally scales (i.e. for all points $\mathbf{x}_n$ in physical space $\mathbf{x}$) by a factor two, then e.g. the two-point correlation function $\mathbf{H}_2$ will globally scale with a factor $e^{2a_s} = 4$ as given in (A.26), and *not* as in (A.27) with the same factor $e^{a_s} = 2$ as the mean velocity $\mathbf{H}_1$ is scaling.

Appendix B. Proof No.2

To prove that (1.24) in Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014) is not admitted as a symmetry transformation of the underlying LMN equations (1.16), we just have to show that the second summand of this transformation (1.24)

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{f}_n :=\ & F(y_{(1)},\dots,y_{(n)})\cdot\psi(\mathbf{v}'_{(1)})\cdot\delta^3(\mathbf{v}'_{(1)}-\mathbf{v}'_{(2)})\cdots\delta^3(\mathbf{v}'_{(1)}-\mathbf{v}'_{(n)}) \qquad \text{(B.1)}\\ =\ & \lambda_{y_{(1)}}\cdots\lambda_{y_{(n)}}\cdot\psi(\lambda_{y_{(1)}}v_{(1)1},v_{(1)2},v_{(1)3})\\ & \cdot\delta(\lambda_{y_{(1)}}v_{(1)1}-\lambda_{y_{(2)}}v_{(2)1})\cdot\delta(v_{(1)2}-v_{(2)2})\cdot\delta(v_{(1)3}-v_{(2)3})\\ & \cdots\delta(\lambda_{y_{(1)}}v_{(1)1}-\lambda_{y_{(n)}}v_{(n)1})\cdot\delta(v_{(1)2}-v_{(n)2})\cdot\delta(v_{(1)3}-v_{(n)3})\\ =\ & \lambda_{y_{(1)}}\cdot\psi(\lambda_{y_{(1)}}v_{(1)1},v_{(1)2},v_{(1)3})\\ & \cdot\delta\left(v_{(2)1}-\frac{\lambda_{y_{(1)}}}{\lambda_{y_{(2)}}}v_{(1)1}\right)\cdot\delta(v_{(2)2}-v_{(1)2})\cdot\delta(v_{(2)3}-v_{(1)3})\\ & \cdots\delta\left(v_{(n)1}-\frac{\lambda_{y_{(1)}}}{\lambda_{y_{(n)}}}v_{(1)1}\right)\cdot\delta(v_{(n)2}-v_{(1)2})\cdot\delta(v_{(n)3}-v_{(1)3}),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\lambda_{y_{(k)}} := \left(1-\frac{y^2_{(k)}}{H^2}\right)^{-1} > 0,\quad k=1,\dots,n, \qquad \text{(B.2)}$$

is not a solution to the considered equations (1.16). The reason is that since (1.16) is a linear system and since the considered transformation (1.24) is a coordinate-invariant superposition of two functions f_n and $\widehat{f}_n$ (B.1), the transformed system relative to the first function f_n only stays then invariant if the second superposed function $\widehat{f}_n$ (B.1) forms a solution to this linear system (1.16). Note that the last identity in (B.1) is based on the well-known factorization and symmetry properties of the Dirac delta function.

Now, since the linear system of equations (1.16) consists of three parts, the convective part on the left-hand side and the pressure and viscous part on the right-hand side, and, since the function $\widehat{f}_n$ (B.1) to be inserted into these three parts does *not* depend on the viscosity parameter ν, it is sufficient to show that if the viscous part of system (1.16) is not vanishing then $\widehat{f}_n$ (B.1) is not a solution to (1.16), and hence does not admit (1.24) as a symmetry transformation. To prove this case, it's sufficient to show that this already happens on the lowest level of order $n=1$.
For example, the viscous part of (1.16) gives the result

$$\begin{aligned}&-\nabla_{\mathbf{v}_{(1)}}\cdot\left[\lim_{\mathbf{x}_{(2)}\to\mathbf{x}_{(1)}}\nu\Delta_{(2)}\int d^3\mathbf{v}_{(2)}\mathbf{v}_{(2)}\widehat{f}_2\right]\\ &\quad= -\partial_{v_{(1)1}}\left[-\frac{2\nu}{H^2}\cdot\lambda^2_{y_{(1)}}v_{(1)1}\cdot\psi(\lambda_{y_{(1)}}v_{(1)1},v_{(1)2},v_{(1)3})\right]\\ &\quad= \frac{2\nu}{H^2}\lambda^2_{y_{(1)}}\left[\psi(\mathbf{v}'_{(1)})+v'_{(1)1}\cdot\frac{\partial}{\partial v'_{(1)1}}\psi(\mathbf{v}'_{(1)})\right]\neq 0, \qquad \text{(B.3)}\end{aligned}$$

which is non-zero, except if the function ψ gets restricted to satisfy the equation

$$\psi(\mathbf{v}'_{(1)})+v'_{(1)1}\cdot\frac{\partial}{\partial v'_{(1)1}}\psi(\mathbf{v}'_{(1)})=0, \qquad \text{(B.4)}$$

for which then also the two remaining parts (the convective and the pressure part) of (1.16) will vanish. Note that $\mathbf{v}'_{(1)}=(v'_{(1)1},v'_{(1)2},v'_{(1)3})$ is defined by (1.26) in having the components

$$v'_{(1)i}=\delta_{1i}\cdot\lambda_{y_{(1)}}v_{(1)1}+\delta_{i2}\cdot v_{(1)2}+\delta_{i3}\cdot v_{(1)3}. \qquad \text{(B.5)}$$

In other words, only if the function ψ is restricted to the solution of equation (B.4)

$$\psi(\mathbf{v}'_{(1)}) = \frac{A(v'_{(1)2}, v'_{(1)3})}{v'_{(1)1}}, \tag{B.6}$$

where A is some arbitrary integration function, then on the lowest level of order $n = 1$ the superposed function $\widehat{f}_n$ (B.1) is a solution of the linear system (1.16), and hence only then admits (1.24) as a symmetry transformation; otherwise, in the general case without specifying ψ as (B.6), transformation (1.24) constitutes no symmetry.

For all higher orders beyond $n = 1$, however, restriction (B.4) is only consistent to a weak (integral) formulation, while in the strong (differential) formulation these higher order restrictions force the function ψ itself to vanish, for which, thus, on the one side function $\widehat{f}_n$ (B.1) turns into the trivial solution $\widehat{f}_n = 0$ of system (1.16), and on the other side where the symmetry transformation (1.24) then turns into the trivial identity transformation $f^*_n = f_n$.

Hence, in the strong formulation for the restrictive equations of ψ to all orders n, the transformation (1.24) is only admitted by system (1.16) as a symmetry if $\psi = 0$. In the weak formulation, however, transformation (1.24) is only admitted as a symmetry if ψ is restricted to the functional structure (B.6). But in this case we face the unwanted problem that ψ through (B.6) then exhibits a non-removable (unphysical) singularity at $v'_{(1)1}$, which definitely has not the smooth functional form as suggested by the authors in "Fig. 1" (Wacławczyk *et al.* (2014), p. 8).

References

Andreev, V. K., Kaptsov, O. V., Pukhnachov, V. V. & Rodionov, A. A. 1998 *Applications of Group-Theoretical Methods in Hydrodynamics*. Kluwer Academic Press.

Avsarkisov, V., Oberlack, M. & Hoyas, S. 2014 New scaling laws for turbulent Poiseuille flow with wall transpiration. *J. Fluid Mech.* **746**, 99–122.

Biferale, L., Boffetta, G. & Castaing, B. 2003 Fully developed turbulence. In *The Kolmogorov Legacy in Physics* (ed. R. Livi & A. Vulpiani), pp. 149–172. Springer.

Bila, N. 2011 On a new method for finding generalized equivalence transformations for differential equations involving arbitrary functions. *J. Sym. Comp.* **46**, 659–671.

Bluman, G. W. & Kumei, S. 1996 *Symmetries and Differential Equations*, 2nd edn. Springer Verlag.

Castellani, E. 2003 On the meaning of symmetry breaking. In *Symmetries in Physics: Philosophical Reflections* (ed. K. Brading & E. Castellani), pp. 321–334. Cambridge University Press.

Davidson, P. A. 2004 *Turbulence: An Introduction for Scientists and Engineers*. Oxford University Press.

Feynman, R. P., Leighton, R. B. & Sands, M. 1963 *The Feynman Lectures on Physics, Vol. I-III*. Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Frewer, M. 2015*a* An example elucidating the mathematical situation in the statistical non-uniqueness problem of turbulence. *arXiv:1508.06962*.

Frewer, M. 2015*b* Application of Lie-group symmetry analysis to an infinite hierarchy of differential equations at the example of first order ODEs. *arXiv:1511.00002*.

Frewer, M., Khujadze, G. & Foysi, H. 2014 On the physical inconsistency of a new statistical scaling symmetry in incompressible Navier-Stokes turbulence. *arXiv:1412.3061*.

Frewer, M., Khujadze, G. & Foysi, H. 2016 A note on the notion "statistical symmetry". *arXiv:1602.08039*.

Friedrich, R., Daitche, A., Kamps, O., Lülff, J., Vosskuhle, M. & Wilczek, M. 2012 The Lundgren-Monin-Novikov hierarchy: Kinetic equations for turbulence. *Comptes Rendus Physique* **13**, 929–953.

Frisch, U. 1985 Fully developed turbulence: Intermittency as a broken symmetry. In *Turbulence and Predictability in Geophysical Fluid Dynamics and Climate Dynamics* (ed. M. Ghil, R. Benzi & G. Parisi), pp. 71–88. Amsterdam, North-Holland.

Frisch, U. 1995 *Turbulence. The Legacy of A.N. Kolmogorov*. Cambridge University Press.

Fushchich, W. I., Shtelen, W. M. & Serov, N. I. 1993 *Symmetry Analyis and Exact Solutions of Equations of Nonlinear Mathematical Physics*. Springer Verlag.

Günther, S. & Oberlack, M. 2005 Incompatibility of the exponential scaling law for a zero pressure gradient boundary layer flow with Reynolds averaged turbulence models. *Phys. Fluids* **17**, 048105–1–4.

Hopf, E. 1952 Statistical hydromechanics and functional calculus. *J. Rational Mech. Anal.* **1**, 87–123.

Ibragimov, N. H. 1994 *Lie Group Analysis of Differential Equations*, *CRC Handbook*, vol. I-III. CRC Press.

Ibragimov, N. H. 2004 Equivalence groups and invariants of linear and non-linear equations. *Archives of ALGA* **1**, 9–69.

Ievlev, V. M. 1970 Approximate equations of turbulent incompressible fluid flow. *Fluid Dynamics* **5** (1), 80–90.

Jackson, J. D. 1998 *Classical Electrodynamics*, 3rd edn. John Wiley & Sons.

Khujadze, G. & Frewer, M. 2016 Revisiting the Lie-group symmetry method for turbulent channel flow with wall transpiration. *arXiv:1606.08396*.

Khujadze, G. & Oberlack, M. 2004 DNS and scaling laws from new symmetries of ZPG turbulent boundary layer flow. *Theor. Comp. Fluid Dyn.* **18**, 391–411.

Kolmogorov, A. N. 1941*a* Local structure of turbulence in an incompressible viscous fluid at very large Reynolds numbers. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **30**, 299–301.

Kolmogorov, A. N. 1941*b* On the degeneration of isotropic turbulence in an incompressible viscous liquid. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **31**, 319–323.

Kolmogorov, A. N. 1941*c* Dissipation of energy in isotropic turbulence. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **32**, 325–327.

Kraichnan, R. H. 1964 Kolmogorov's hypotheses and eulerian turbulence theory. *Phys. Fluids* **7** (11), 1723–1734.

Kraichnan, R. H. 1965 Lagrangian-history closure approximation for turbulence. *Phys. Fluids* **8** (4), 575–598.

Kraichnan, R. H. 1968 Lagrangian-history statistical theory for Burgers' equation. *Phys. Fluids* **11** (2), 265–277.

Kurths, J. & Pikovsky, A. S. 1995 Symmetry breaking in distributed systems and modulational spatio-temporal intermittency. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* **5** (10), 1893–1899.

Lundgren, T. S. 1967 Distribution functions in the statistical theory of turbulence. *Phys. Fluids* **10**, 969–975.

Marro, J. 2014 *Physics, Nature and Society. A Guide to Order and Complexity in Our World*. Springer Verlag.

McComb, W. D. 1990 *The Physics of Fluid Turbulence*. Clarendon Press Oxford.

McComb, W. D. 2014 *Homogeneous, Isotropic Turbulence: Phenomenology, Renormalization and Statistical Closures*. Oxford University Press.

Meleshko, S. V. 1996 Generalization of the equivalence transformations. *J. Nonlin. Math. Phys.* **3** (1-2), 170–174.

Meleshko, S. V. 2005 *Methods for constructing exact solutions of partial differential equations*. Springer Verlag.

Monin, A. S. 1967 Equations of turbulent motion. *J. Appl. Math. Mech.* **31** (6), 1057–1068.

Monin, A. S. & Yaglom, A. M. 1975 *Statistical Fluid Mechanics, Vol. II*. MIT Press.

Oberlack, M. 2002 On the decay exponent of isotropic turbulence. *PAMM* **1** (1), 294–297.

Oberlack, M., Cabot, W., Reif, B. A. Pettersson & Weller, T. 2006 Group analysis, direct numerical simulation and modelling of a turbulent channel flow with streamwise rotation. *J. Fluid Mech.* **562**, 383–403.

Oberlack, M. & Günther, S. 2003 Shear-free turbulent diffusion - classical and new scaling laws. *Fluid Dyn. Res.* **33**, 453–476.

Oberlack, M. & Rosteck, A. 2010 New statistical symmetries of the multi-point equations and its importance for turbulent scaling laws. *Discrete Continuous Dyn. Syst.* **Ser. S 3**, 451–471.

Oberlack, M. & Zieleniewicz, A. 2013 Statistical symmetries and its impact on new decay modes and integral invariants of decaying turbulence. *Journal of Turbulence* **14** (2), 4–22.

Olver, P. J. 1993 *Applications of Lie Groups to Differential Equations*, 2nd edn. Springer Verlag.

Ovsiannikov, L. V. 1982 *Group Analysis of Differential Equations*, 2nd edn. Academic Press.

Penrose, R. 2005 *The Road to Reality: A Complete Guide to the Laws of the Universe*. Alfred A. Knopf Publishing.

Polyanin, A. D. 2002 *Handbook of Linear Partial Differential Equations for Engineers and Scientists*. CRC Press.

Pope, S. B. 2000 *Turbulent Flows*. Cambridge University Press.

Rosteck, A. & Oberlack, M. 2011 Lie algebra of the symmetries of the multi-point equations in statistical turbulence theory. *J. Nonlinear Math. Phys.* **18**, 251–264.

Sagaut, P. & Cambon, C. 2008 *Homogeneous Turbulence Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press.

Saint-Michel, B., Daviaud, F. & Dubrulle, B. 2013 A zero-mode mechanism for spontaneous symmetry breaking in a turbulent von Kármán flow. *Preprint, arXiv:1305.3389* pp. 1–17.

She, Z.-S., Chen, X. & Hussain, F. 2011 A Lie-group derivation of a multi-layer mixing length formula for turbulent channel and pipe flow. *Preprint, arXiv:1112.6312*.

Shen, H. H. & Wray, A. A. 1991 Stationary turbulent closure via the Hopf functional equation. *J. Stat. Phys.* **65**, 33–52.

Staffolani, N., Wacławczyk, M., Oberlack, M., Friedrich, R. & Wilczek, M. 2014 Lie symmetries of the Lundgren-Monin-Novikov hierarchy. In *Progress in Turbulence V*, pp. 47–51. Springer.

Stephani, H. 1989 *Differential Equations. Their solutions using symmetries*. Cambridge University Press.

Tsinober, A. 2013 *The Essence of Turbulence as a Physical Phenomenon*. Springer Verlag.

Wacławczyk, M., Staffolani, N., Oberlack, M., Rosteck, A., Wilczek, M. & Friedrich, R. 2014 Statistical symmetries of the Lundgren-Monin-Novikov hierarchy. *Phys. Rev. E* **90**, 013022.

Weinberg, S. 2000 *The Quantum Theory of Fields, Volume I-III*. Cambridge University Press.

Wilczek, M. 2010 Statistical and numerical investigations of fluid turbulence. PhD thesis, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster.